



G. Cooke sc.

ADAM SCHALL,

Jesuit Mandarin

FROM A PRINT IN KIRCHER'S "LA CHINE ILLUSTRÉE"

HISTORY

OF

THE JESUITS:

FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THEIR SOCIETY TO ITS SUPPRESSION
BY POPE CLEMENT XIV.;


THEIR MISSIONS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD;
THEIR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AND LITERATURE; WITH THEIR REVIVAL
AND PRESENT STATE.

BY

ANDREW STEINMETZ,

AUTHOR OF "THE NOVITIATE," "THE JESUIT IN THE FAMILY."

WOOD ENGRAVINGS BY GEORGE MEASOM.



IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

RICHARD BENTLEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,
PUBLISHER IN ORDINARY TO HER MAJESTY.

1848.

BX

3706

.58

1848

V. 3

LONDON :

BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

CONTENTS TO VOL. III.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Book VII. or BOBADILLA (continued) | 1 |
| Book VIII. or LE JAY | 370 |
| Book IX. or CODURIUS | 537 |
| Book X. or BROUET | 574 |

BOOK VII. OR, BOBADILLA.

(CONTINUED.)

IT is time now for us to consider the Company within herself—her internal condition, after meddling so extensively with the “foul chimneys” of the world. All was confusion—desperate contention—implacable discord. Thirteen years have been added to the reign of Aquaviva over the Company of Jesus. The strong man has wielded his power vigorously—stern, resolute, and unflinching. The discontented Spanish Jesuits conceived the design of making themselves independent of the Roman generalate. The method adopted by the malcontents to effectuate their design was actually suicidal—they began with laying bare the abuses and corruptions of the Company—their own Company—the Company of Jesus. *Mariana*, the eloquent speculator on royalty and the mysteries of king-killing, a man of vast authority in the Company, headed the malcontents against the resolute Aquaviva.¹ The general had

¹ The highest praises are awarded to Mariana in the *Bibliotheca* of the Jesuits. He is stated to have been a rigid observer of holy poverty, of rare abstinence, and of incredible fortitude in his sorrows, which his conscientious denouncement of the abuses of the Company multiplied for him exceedingly. He went to confession every day, and was highly scrupulous in the matter of chastity. “It

managed the government of the Company by three or four favoured members, in each province, to the utter neglect of the most learned and weighty men whom the Company or the Church could boast—and not without haughty demeanour.¹ In his fourth chapter, Mariana details numerous troubles and contentions amongst the members, owing to the youthful petulance and *ignorance* of the superiors. In the method of tuition he finds notable defects: in fact, he says the thing is undeniable that less Latin was then known in Spain than fifty years before; and that one of the principal causes of the calamity was the fact that the Company had the charge of education.² The want of perseverance in any given method was the source of the deficiency. There were as many methods as there were masters: all was experiment, and never a system. What was asserted by one was contradicted by another: what was announced by one as evident, another pronounced false—so that the doctrine of the Jesuits was similar to Penelope's web, woven by day, and unravelled by night.³ As might be expected, numerous abuses attended the increase of the lay-brotherhood. Mariana says that of five hundred and

might be a result of this virtue that his hands in death were as tractable as though he were alive"!! So saith the Jesuit biographer.—*Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu.* p. 258, ed. Ant. 1643.

¹ "Mírese si procede este dolor de alçarse el general, y tres o quatro, en cada provincia, con todo el gobierno, sin dar parte à los otros, aunque sean personas de la mas graves y doctas que ay en la yglesia."—*Del Governo de la Compañia de Jesus*, c. iii.

² "No ay duda, sino que oy en España se sabe menos Latin que ahora cinquenta años. Creo yo, antes lo tengo por cierto, que una de las mas principales causas deste daño es, estar la Compañia en cargada destos estudios."—*Ib.* c. vi.

³ "Lo que uno dize, otro le desdize; lo que uno tiene por claro, otro dize que no es verdad; con que la doctrina de los nuestros viene a ser semejante a la tela de Penelope, lo que se texe de dia se destexe de noche."—*Ib.*

forty Jesuits in the province, two hundred and thirty were lay-brothers ; and their cost was excessive. Two lay-brothers cost as much as three others. There were some good men among them : but in general they were men of small capacity, rough natures, such as were taken from the shops or the plough. They frequented the lowest of the people : they became easily secularised ; though they might not commit themselves, they tarnished the fair fame of the Company. The scholars of the Company grew up in idleness, and became presumptuous from their ignorance. The lay-brothers were the constant source of contentions ; and Mariana thought that they would be the beginning of the Company's depravity and destruction.¹ By the Fifth Congregation, in 1593, it was decreed that no colleges should be accepted without fixed revenues for the support of at least thirty Jesuits, if for tuition in the humanity-studies or the languages and general education :—now, allowing the very moderate cost of 30*l.* for each Jesuit *per annum*—this decree demanded 900*l.* a year for the *gratis*-education of the Company of Jesus. But if the three courses of philosophy were demanded in addition by the founders, there must be a fixed revenue for the support of sixty Jesuits at least, equal to 1800*l.* *per annum* : in the case of an university, or where theology and holy writ were to be taught, provision was to be made for at least one hundred Jesuits, equal to 3000*l.* *per annum*.² It must be evident that the *gratis*-education of holy

¹ Ibid. c. vii.

² Canon. V. Cong. 8, Inst. S. J. p. 1061, t. i. In placing the average so low as 30*l.* I have perhaps not done justice to the "charity" of princes and other founders of Jesuit houses. Mariana says that each Jesuit in the house of Toledo cost 110 ducats *per annum*, or about 50*l.*—*Del Governo*,—in the conclusion.

Father Ignatius has assumed a formidable aspect towards the purses of mankind. But, notwithstanding the previous care taken to ensure good foundations, Mariana tells us that the debts of the Spanish province were very great—exceeding 250,000 ducats. To immoderate expenditure, Mariana ascribes the startling admission. The long black robes of the Jesuits, he says, were of woollen stuff, and expensive. Paper, ink, books, travelling expenses, were allowed to all, and advantage was freely taken of the privilege. The brothers were fond of spending money, and they dissipated much: and he thinks that the novices imbibed no very economical principles whilst they beheld so much expenditure, so many luxuries, the display of mules and carriages—reaching at length a pitch of extravagance as though they were the sons of noblemen, without restraint. Then, again, some Jesuits would build, others would demolish—very expensive fancies, according to Mariana. The government of the superiors being absolute and independent, at least as far as the subjects are concerned, each has his own ideas: one plants, another pulls up: one establishes, another abolishes; and all spend or waste large sums of money. Travelling expenses and the postage of letters, he says, amounted to an incredible sum. A provincial stated that the annual expenditure of the province was more than 3000 ducats, about 1500*l*.¹

The management of the Company's farms was another source of abuse. "Opinions were conflicting on the subject, as on all others of the Company," says Mariana, "without the decree of the Second Congregation having been sufficient to regulate us.

Farms and
vineyards.

¹ Mariana, *ubi supra*, c. viii.

totally prohibiting the management of farms by Our men.”¹ Great danger to virtue attended this abuse among the Jesuits, “who, by these occupations, wandered alone in the fields, through the villages, frequenting women, and all sorts of people, without restraint and decorum. Repeated and gross faults, although concealed, will at length become known,” says Mariana. “In the midst of so many carriages and herdsmen, so many mules and oxen, our men acquire a spirit by no means humble and devout, because the inward man advances exactly like the outward; and strangers, seeing such display, are forced to believe that we abound in everything: this is so true, that the single house of Villarejo has filled the whole kingdom with the notion that we are very opulent. So that it is impossible to disabuse the world of this opinion by mere words, telling them that the said House

¹ “Sin que aya bastado un decreto de la Segunda Congregación, en que totalmente se vedan a los nuestros las grangerias,” c. ix. I have given this decree in the Second Volume. This and other exclusively Jesuit-matter in the book, prove that it must have been written by a Jesuit, if not by Mariana. We may be sure that none but the Jesuits were, at that period, acquainted with the secret decrees of the Congregations. The whole book evinces a perfect knowledge of the Institute; and it is impossible to confute this title to authenticity. Of course the Jesuits affect to deny its *entire* authorship by Mariana: but the Jesuits deny every thing when it suits their purpose so to do. Ranke quotes the book as authentic; and no one who has read any other of Mariana’s works, will fail to note the perfect identity of style throughout—it is the same terse but crabbed conciseness, and vigorous point of Mariana throughout. It was published after his death. The MS. was taken from him by a Franciscan, whilst the Jesuit was in prison for his “rebellion.” Feller the Jesuit says, “It is nevertheless probable that the foundations of the work are Mariana’s. And why should he not think he saw, or even why should he not see, really some defects in the government of the Company? Where is the government without defects? The best is that which has fewest—*optimus ille est qui minimis argetur*”—but Feller forgets the vain boast of all Jesuits, that the Company was necessarily in the hands of the Almighty, and those of the Virgin Mary, to whom its first century was especially dedicated by the Jesuit Pennequin, in three books of most incongruous Elegies. The book is admitted to be Mariana’s in the *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu*—but “*perhaps with not a few additions.*”—P. 259. Ant. 1643.

is in extreme want, whilst so large a train of oxen, and mules, and herdsmen, attest the contrary." Abuses begat abuses. Exemption from tithes did not satisfy the Jesuits : but "too zealous for the temporalities, they passed from feet to hands, that is, they resolved to obtain by contention what they ought to have gained more gently by patience ; and thereby they have forced law-suits upon us with difficulties and expense such as to neutralise whatever was gained. As for the farming of vineyards, I know not what to say, except that at Toledo they sell their wine a third dearer than other traders, and, nevertheless, we do not find that any of them are richer thereby. They complain that the greater part of what is collected is spent in the payment of labourers ; . . . but would it not be more to the purpose, if Our men would hold more to our Institute, to the requirements of modesty and humility—nay, even to repose, which is so necessary for our other functions, and which is less dangerous and noisy ?" ¹

These are mere preliminaries to the enterprise of Mariana — mere skirmishes before the pitched battle, and the tug of war. It is the *Monarchy* of the Company which makes the hater of tyrants double his usual size and stature. *Singularis ferus depastus est eam*, he cries, "a strange wild beast hath devoured her." After some sensible remarks on the primitive notion of the Company, and on governments in general, Mariana says :—"Though our laws are excessively numerous, the general nevertheless is absolute—there are no laws for him—whether in promoting to the rank of the professed, in giving appointments, or in founding colleges, and an infinity of

The abuses
of the gene-
ral and the
superiors.

¹ Mariana, *ut antea*.

other matters. If there be laws, he has the power to dispense with them. Each provincial with two or three confidants have it all their own way in the provinces, without caring at all for others, although in every respect preferable to themselves. Rome is at a distance : the general neither knows the persons nor the facts, or, if he does, these are accompanied with circumstances to bias his judgment, which may be counted on. . . . Private affection and prejudices sway the government at Rome. . . . I conclude that it is necessary to moderate this monarchy, and to stop its course : for it is evident that 10,000 men cannot be governed like 600.¹ If the general alone applied this method of government—this monarchy, the thing would be bearable—at least, the evils would not be so great. But the evil is, that the provincials, and the immediate superiors, apply the same method—being absolute, without a curb or a check on their proceedings, although all their subjects may be of a different opinion : so that on any emergency whatever, the superior can execute his will, in spite of all opinions to the contrary in his subjects. Discontentment is the result If there be laws, they are not kept at all, and each one wrests them as he likes ; and there are not laws for all contingencies, nor are there penalties awarded for those who fail by acting on their own judgment or for changing enactments. I never saw any one amongst us punished for that misdemeanour. Underlings are appointed to office, and not the most worthy. Ready subservience to the distant policy is the motive of such appointments. Those who excel others are carefully shunned and put down. It has been well said that—*Hæc tyranni vox est*,

¹ Ibid. *ut antea*, c. x.

Quicquid excelsum in regno, cadat—Whatever is highest in the kingdom should be lowered : and another—*Tyrannis boni, quam mali, suspiciores sunt*—the good are more suspicious to tyrants than the bad.” Talk of punishment for evil-doing ! “I could bring forward examples of villanous cases passed over in silence ; and even at the present time the method is still more in practice, because the standard of revolt is raised amongst us—*por estar la gente alborotada*. If any one shows his teeth, they let him alone ; and if he goes to Rome, and particularly if he have favour, all is hushed up ; but there is a gibbet for the less fortunate members—*la horca se queda para los miserables*.” To defend this monarchy, recourse was had to spies, “of whom it is said there are many amongst us, though cloaked under a more honourable name, to gain favour and credit in doing evil ; also flatterers—a very common vice, and the ready way for surmounting the perplexities in the government of the Company ; for those at Rome, being determined to settle all affairs by proxy, know not what to do, in the conflicting accounts transmitted. Long delays ensue—appointments are left vacant—strife and machinations follow, with complaints to the pope and other potentates.¹ These offices and appointments are distributed amongst a few persons : whilst some remain superiors for twenty or thirty years, others, who by common opinion are not less qualified, are excluded for ever under various pretences. Some are set aside on the pretence, that they are too choleric ; others, that they are melancholic ; others, that they are not so well united to the general as they ought to be ; and as it happens that the greatest minds and endow-

¹ *Ibid.* *ut antea*, c. xi.

ments have always some defect, as Plato and Cicero observe, the result is, that the greater part of these great minds remain excluded from the government. Whence follows another impropriety, namely, that they raise to these appointments young and unlettered men, of little weight—not because they are properly qualified, but because, being more enterprising, they know how to wheedle opportunity. Hence all is disturbance: for those whom nature has advanced, and who, for that very reason, are already obnoxious to hatred and dislike, are left behind and discontented; and those who ought to be subjects, are advanced in every way, and cannot easily be supplanted; the latter are full of pride: the former full of irritation. A crying abuse, and which, having continued so many years, has filled hearts with bitterness and discontentment, which generate, and will ever generate, as occasion offers, revolt and mutiny, as we behold daily. I have read, in Aristotle's *Politics*, that every republic must necessarily have for enemies, all those who see themselves excluded from the dignities common to all; wherefore I do not wonder that in the Company there are so many complainers, who consider themselves aggrieved, and cause the disturbances which we behold—particularly as, in our Company, individuals have neither an active nor passive vote in the appointments I will add, that, by the violence which was used in the election of Everard Mercurian to the generalate, the minds of many were very much alienated: the more, that the Spanish nation is persuaded that it remains for ever excluded from the generalate. True or false, this persuasion necessarily produces disgust and disunion, the more because this nation founded, honoured, taught, and even supported the Company for

a long period with its substance. For the sake of peace, remedies must be applied to this disease for the future, or disgust and disturbances will daily increase ; this is not suggested by ambition, but, unfortunately, by most important aggravation, well known to all.”¹

No one will be surprised to hear of abuses resulting from the secret declarations of faults, or syndications as they were called, “made to the superior in secret, without proof, without the intervention of the party in question.” Mariana makes some forcible remarks on the pernicious practice so much in vogue under the reigns of Nero, Domitian, and the rest of tyrants, and he learnedly appeals to history for the condemnation of the practice—stating that a certain Council of the Church forbade every Christian the trade, denying him the sacrament even at the hour of death, upon conviction, “Memorable severity,” he exclaims. “During the past years this sort of government has been much in use in the Company. Whilst the members were good and few in number, the practice could be endured : but since that time, great complaints have arisen against these syndications, and means have been sought to stop the evil : but I am not aware that the remedy has been sufficient” The informations or reports were contradictory, and sometimes false—the result of party-jealousies and piques. “It is the poison of union and fraternal charity for men not to confide in each other, fearing that, whoever can, *will* sell them to gain favour for himself. *I dare affirm, that if the Archives at Rome were examined, there would not be found a single good man amongst us, at least amongst us who are at a distance,*

Evil effects of
“Manifesta-
tion” or the
Spy-system.

¹ Ibid. *ut antea*, c. xii.

and unknown to the general ; for we are all spotted, some more, some less.¹ It may be said that the archives are well kept : but we can see if this be true, when we consider who are the persons to whom they are entrusted, and even what happened to Father Acosta, and what they ferreted out of the archives against him, for no other reason than because he procured the convocation of the General Congregation against the will of the general : in my opinion, ruffians could not have done worse by Acosta. And the worst is, that none were punished for this transaction : those who took these steps were the greatest *confidants*.”²

The governmental partyism of the Company withheld the rewards due to merit and acquirements, and the result was, “that, amongst the many men of intellect who entered the Company, more than any other Order, notwithstanding the leisure they had for their studies, few became men of letters—for want of opportunities to call forth their talents. Good preachers were deficient, because there was no distinction made between the good and the bad : mediocrity was, therefore, the usual standard. The same remark applies to ecclesiastical science and literature which have fallen off sadly, neglected, unvalued. It seems, also, impossible for the Latin schools to continue. Now virtue will fall off in like manner, and God grant that it be not already weakened in many. So much for rewards. As for chastisements, it is certain that there are none. Let a man only be bold, and, having done what he pleases, let him make use of some

Touching re-
wards and
punishments.

¹ “Yo osaria asegurar que si los Archivos de Roma se desembuelven, que no se hallara uno solo que sea hombre de bien, a lo menos de los que estamos lexos,” &c.—*Ibid.* c. xiii.

² *Ibid.* *ut antea*, c. xiii.

covering, and there the matter remains. I set aside the very great derelictions of which I could relate a great number, which without doubt are dissimulated, under pretext that they are not sufficiently proved, or else, to avoid uproar, a “hue and cry” in the streets.¹ For it seems that *all our government has no other object but to conceal faults and throw dust upon them—a cubrir y hechar tierra*—as if fire could avoid sending forth its smoke. It is only on a few miserable wretches, without power and protectors, that they pour the measure of chastisement and rigour—of which examples are not wanting.² In other matters and cases, a man shall commit great faults and enormities without his gown being touched by way of penalty. A provincial or rector will transgress, will create confusion everywhere, infringing rules and constitutions, will build up, break down, without rhyme or reason,—will dissipate the wealth of the Company, or will even give it to his relatives—the punishment he will receive after many years of transgression will be removal from his office, and oftener still, they will better his condition. Who knows of any superior who has been punished for these transgressions? I, at least, know of none.³ Good superiors are needed—

¹ “Dexo delictos muy graves, que sin duda se dissimulan, y se podrian aqui contar muchos que no se pruevan bastantemente, o por no hazer ruydo, y que no nos oygan en la calle.”

² “Que no parece, sino que todo el gobierno se endereça a cubrir y hechar tierra, como si el fuego pudiesse dexar de hechar de si humo ; solo casi en algunos tristes, que no tienen fuerças ni valedores, emplean sus azeros y rigor. No faltan exemplos desto.”

³ “Un Provincial o Rector hará cosas muy indevidas, alborotará la gente, quebrantará reglas y Constituciones, edificará, derribará sin proposito, sin consulta, hundirá la hazienda, y aun dará a parientes : el castigo a cabo de muchos años es quitarle el officio, y aun las mas vezes, mejorarle. Ay quien sepa de algun superior, que por estas causas aya sido castigado ? Yo a lo menos no tengo noticia.”—*Ibid.* ut antea, c. xiv.

men of courage and dignity. “It is a deplorable thing that, for our sins, the contrary takes place in every respect. The good are afflicted, either without cause or for slight offences, nay, even extinguished—*muertos*—in the expectation that they will neither speak nor resist—melancholy examples of this could I relate—whilst the wicked are promoted, because they are feared. A proof that our government is disorganised and nerveless, as I have affirmed—enough to deserve that God should utterly destroy the Company—*para que Dios hunda Compañía!*”¹

Mariana lets us into the secret of Jesuit occupations in those days. “The importunity of the world is great ; and as they assist us with their alms, they wish us, in return, to assist them in all their affairs—their marriages, to make their wills for them, to make interest for them with the great in their pretensions, in their law-suits, their accounts, in their affairs with judges ; and they even wish us to supply their enjoyments and pleasures or necessities for their families. It is quite wonderful what work they give us—I suspect that some day they will require us to be their butlers (if it has not happened already), their cooks, their sweepers, under pretext that these are works of piety ; and thereby our men are secularised, and tramp abroad more than they ought, for the most part occupied with the affairs of friends, relatives, and persons recommended to us. The abuse has gone to

Occupations
of the Je-
suits.

¹ “Es cosa miserable que por nuestros pecados muchas vezes se haze al contrario de todo esto, que los buenos, o sin causa, o por cosas ligeras, son affligidos, y aun muertos, por pensar que no hablaran ni resistiran, de que se podrian poner lastimosos exemplos ; y los ruines son sobrellevados, porque les tienen miedo. Que es estar el gobierno mal traçado, y sin niervos, como arriba se dixo ; punto que basta para que Dios hunda la Compañía.”—*Ib. ut antea*, c. xiv.

such lengths that there are many lords, ecclesiastical and secular, who retain in their suite, whithersoever they go, some of our men, under the title of confessors, just as if they were their chaplains ; and these go to their houses to confess them and their domestics, and to say mass in their oratories,—without mentioning other matters in which they are made useful. In the city of Valladolid alone, there must be more than twelve fathers embarrassed with these occupations.”¹ The result was, their infringement of the rules, with resistance to their superiors, presuming on the favour they enjoyed with the great — “as daily experience attests,” says Mariana — *come cada dia se experimenta*. “Plutarch wrote a treatise, in which he proves that philosophers ought to treat with princes, but no man of sense will approve of immoderate intercourse with them.” The Dominicans experienced these evils in their commencement, and they passed a decree that none of their body should be seen in the suite of those personages. “I believe that the Company will find itself some day in that necessity, and even forced to deprive the general of his authority to grant dispensations in the matter.”²

“I have much enlarged, and have been very bold in noticing so many diseases in our government,” says

Other abuses. Mariana, in conclusion ; — “particularly in matters which are generally considered well regulated, and which, as such, are practised and continued If I have touched many points, be it known that I have omitted others, and these in no small number. I might speak of the poverty of the professed, and ask if it be observed, whilst most of them live in the colleges, and five-sixths are maintained

¹ Ibid. c. xx.

² Ibid. c. xx.

by the revenues of the said colleges—so that these revenues are not for the support of the colleges, but for those who inhabit them, who happen to be professed members in great numbers. I might also speak of the presents which are carried hence to Rome—with the view of paving the way to office At first they drew to Rome money enough to support themselves, especially from Spain, whereat there was great tumult, with contention. Besides, a great many of us travel, and with more luggage than beseems men professing poverty ; and not on foot—yea, they do not at all scruple to go in carriages. I might touch on our amusements, which are in great number, and in some places last several months together, producing many evils, for many reasons, and nursing our youth in the love of ease and pleasure, as daily experience attests. I should also have to speak of the renunciations of inheritances. I believe that this point has been in nowise reformed : it is nevertheless inconsistent for a religious to retain the claim to property for so many years ; for if it be said that it is not usual, we know well enough how easy it is to get a dispensation or licence. We have many idlers amongst us ; their numbers increase daily ; they are of no use but to get up small cliques for conversation and scheming, not to mention worse objects. The enjoyments of some are excessive and scandalous : so likewise are our waste and dissipation. I affirm that if the accounts be examined, in this house of Toledo, the annual expense of each member amounts to a hundred and ten ducats, (about 50*l.*.) which is frightful to think of. Our dress also might be more moderate, and more in accordance with poverty.” Mariana wishes to leave no erroneous impression respecting the purity

of his motives in dissecting these abuses of his Company ; and so he says :—" All I have to add is, that though in this treatise I have noticed the faults of our government, yet if I wished to enlarge on the good things of that Congregation, the treatise would be very long : for doubtless it is one of the best sorts of professions in the Church ; and the individuals are the best people in the world, as far as I can see. A chosen plant of God, her enterprises and her occupations the most glorious and exalted that have ever been seen or read of—truly worthy to be assisted not only by her children, but also by princes and all the world, &c., &c." ¹

Such were the existing abuses. The spirit of discontentment or of terror was universal in the Company. The old Spanish Jesuits were resolved to play the *Bobadilla* once more. As they could expect to effect no change in the government by any inward tendency to health in the Company, they had recourse to other physicians. They resolved to rouse the dragon of the Inquisition against the Company of Jesus ! One of the malcontents, impelled, as he said, by conscientious scruples, accused his Order of concealing and even remitting enormous crimes when committed by the members, according to the privileges of the Company, and by way of throwing dust on what was foul and disgusting. A certain confessor was informed against for having perverted the sanctity of confession to attempt the chastity of a young female—a crime which, in Spain, was reserved for the jurisdiction of the holy Inquisitors.² Suddenly the

A Jesuit accuses a criminal brother.

¹ "Tratado del gobierno de la Compañía de Jesus . . . por el muy docto Padre maestro Mariana de la misma Compañía." Genév. 1630 (2nd tom. du Merc. Jesuite).

² Sacchin. P. V. lib. ii. 85 ; Ranke, p. 203. "Yea, for some have married

Inquisition caused the provincial, who was implicated in a case of this kind, and some of his most active associates, to be arrested. Other accusations were brought forward after this beginning, and the Inquisition caused

wives !” exclaims L. O., “ that hath beene an oocular wnesse of their Impos-
tures and Hipoerisie,” in the *Speculum Jesuiticum*, or the Jesuites’ Looking-
glasse, A.D. 1629. “ I will name Father Mena (that famous Spanish preacher,
and a Jesuite) for one ; and therefore to satisfie the reader, I will recite the
whole historie. There dwelt in Valladolid in Spaine a lady (her husband being
dead, and she left a rich widow in the flower of her age), and therefore not like
to have any more husbands ; for it is a great dishonour for any lady or gentle-
woman in that countrey, that is a widow (were she never so young), to marrie
again, and indeed there is no man of any fashion, that will marrie with a
widow. This lady (I say) did always resort unto good Father Mena to confesse,
who in the end fell in love (as it is the custome among the Jesuites) with his
prettie penitent or ghostly child : but he could not by any meanes get her to
yeeld unto his [passion] ; for she told him that no man living [should prevail
over her] but her husband. Mena seeing her constant resolution to be such,
that he could not prevail, began to try another way to assault her chastity ; and
therefore he sued her to have her to his wife, alleaging many proofes out of the
holy Scriptures, and fathers, that priests and Jesuits might have wives, as well
as other men ; and that God did never forbid marriage, but did allow of it, and
withall recommended it, yea, that the first miracle that our Saviour did, was at
a wedding in Canaa of Galely, and lastly, that the restriction or restraint of
priests’ marriage, was but a politick constitution sprung up of late years. With
these, and many other proofes and reasons, he persuaded her in the end to
become his wife ; but with this proviso, that neither of them should reveale
the matter to any living man. And thereupon, within a short time after, they
both, disguising themselves, went to some poore priest, and were married, and
lived many yeeres after. In the end this lady fell sicke of a burning fever,
and being (in her owne opinion) past all hope of recoverie, began to be wonder-
fully perplexed in mind, that she had lead such a life with Father Mena, verily
believing that if she should dye in that mortall sinne (as she imagined) without
confession and absolution, that she should be damned : for she thought Father
Mena could not forgive her that haynous offence, because he had a hand therein
himself. And therefore out of a scrupulous and timorous conscience, she sent,
secretly and unknowne to Mena, for another grave friar, of another Order, to
heare her confession, and to administer some spirituall comfort unto her, in that
poore estate wherein she then was. The friar being come, and perceiving how
the case stood, would not absolve her of the fact, unless she would reveale all
Father Mena’s proceedings unto some of her owne, and her husband’s nearest
kindred in his presence, and desire them to forgive her fault, and revenge her
wrongs ; for he durst not discover the matter, because it was revealed unto him
under the seale of confession, as they terme it, albeit he would have the Jesuites

the statutes of the Order to be delivered up, and proceeded to further arrests. There arose among the true-believing Spaniards an excitement the more vehement, inasmuch as its cause was so obscure, and the opinion became current, that the Jesuits had been arrested on account of some heresy. Meanwhile the Inquisition could only inflict punishment ; but could not make any change in the constitution of the Order. Here the malcontents did not stop short, but appealed to the king, whom they beset with memorials, complaining against the defects in their constitution. To Philip II. that constitution had never been satisfactory. He used to say that he could see through all other orders ; but

disgraced because he loved them not. The lady (seeing there was no other remedy) was contented, and did as he advised her. Whereupon her friends and kinsfolkes understanding how she was not onely abused in her honour and reputation by the Jesuite, but also cheated of the best part of her estate, being enraged, like men out of their wits, complayned unto the *Inquisition-house*, and caused good Father Mena to be apprehended and layd in safe custody, who very stoutly stood to his tacklings, and offered to prove the marriage lawful. The Jesuites (seeing the honour and reputation of their Order to be called in question, and mightily shaken by all the other orders, and swarmes of friers, their mortall enemies, and the ladie's friends, who with tooth and naile prosecuted the matter against Father Mena) perswaded both the king and inquisitors that Father Mena was frantick, and requested that they might have him into their custody to be dealt withall, and punished as they should see cause, according to many graces and priviledges then-tofore granted unto them by severall popes. In fine, the king and the inquisitors, at the request (or rather command) of the pope's legat or nuntius (whom the Jesuites had formerly annointed in the fist) and withall, for feare of giving scandall, if Protestants (whom they call Hereticks) should have notice thereof, gave order that Father Mena should be (in the night time) conveyed secretly unto the Jesuites' college, which is called *casa professa*. So that by this meanes the matter was hushed up, and the lady's friends, yea, all other men commanded to keepe silence. What became of him afterwards I could never know : but it is thought that they conveyed him unto some other of their colledges in some foraigne kingdome or province ; for it was then publicly reported, that the rest of the Jesuites knew of the marriage as well as Mena, and that they had all the money that he had from her, to the use of their colledge. As for the lady she recovered her health, and became a religious nunne afterwards, as I was told. This was in the year 1607, as far as I can remember."—*Speculum Jesuiticum*, p. 5, et seq.

the Jesuits alone he could not understand. He was particularly struck with the apparent truth of what was said to him respecting the abuse of absolute authority, and the monstrous system of secret accusation. Amidst the occupations of the great European struggle in which he was engaged, he bent his attention to this matter likewise. He pointedly enjoined Bishop Manrique, of Carthagena, to hold a visitation of the Order, especially with regard to those two points, on which Mariana so feelingly enlarges.

Aquaviva was not dismayed. The man concealed a profound inflexibility under an aspect of great mildness and great suavity of manners—a character like Clement VIII. and many others of that age—in the utmost degree deliberate, moderate, prudent, and practising that taciturnity whose speech is said to have been given to conceal, not to express, ideas. Never had Aquaviva ventured to pronounce a positive judgment: he would not even suffer one to be uttered in his presence, least of all upon a whole nation. His secretaries were expressly directed to avoid every offensive, every bitter word. He loved piety,—even its outward appearance. In his bearing, at the altar, he expressed a rapt enjoyment of the service; still he kept aloof from every tincture of enthusiasm. He refused permission to print an exposition of Solomon's song, because he thought it offensive—that the language fluctuated on the confines of sensual and spiritual love. Even when he chided, he had the art of winning the feelings: he manifested the superiority of calmness: he led the erring into the right path by substantial arguments: the young clung to him with ardour. “One must love him,” writes Maximilian of Bavaria to his father, from Rome, “One must love

Aquaviva
described.

him, if one but looks on him." These qualities, his indefatigable activity, even his noble descent, and the constantly-increasing importance of his Order, procured him an eminent position in Rome. If his adversaries succeeded in gaining over the national authorities in Spain, he, on the other hand, had in his favour the Roman court, which he had known from his youth upwards, (he was chamberlain when he entered the Order,) and with which he knew how to deal, with the mastery of innate and practised talents.¹

Long had the source of contention in the Order subsisted. During the reigns of the former popes, Aquaviva's crafty policy. Aquaviva had managed to forfend a catastrophe. It was easy for him to excite the antipathies of Sixtus V. against the efforts of the Spanish members. The pope had conceived the notion of making Rome more than ever the metropolis of all Christendom :—Aquaviva represented to him that the object sought in Spain was no less than to make themselves independent of Rome. Nor was that all. Pope Sixtus hated nothing so much as illegitimate birth : Aquaviva intimated to him that Manrique, the bishop selected to make the visitation, was a bastard. This was enough to induce the pope to recall the approval he had already given of the visitation. He likewise transferred the proceedings against the provincial to Rome. Under Gregory XIV., the general succeeded in obtaining a formal confirmation of the Institutes of his order.²

Nor was the hostile party less obstinate and crafty. They saw clearly that they must assail the general

¹ Ranke, p. 204 ; Sacchin. and Juvenci, P. V. t. post. xi. 21, xxv, 33, *et seq.*

² Ranke, *ubi supra* ; Juvenc. lib. xi. The title of the book is *Societas domesticis motibus agitata*, *The Company agitated by domestic movements.*

himself at the Roman Court. King Philip had taken up their cause ; and the Jesuit Acosta was sent to the pope to induce his Holiness to convoke the Congregation, and to get Aquaviva sent out of the way during the assembly at the Gesù.

That of his
rebels equally
so.

A coincidence favoured the scheme. It happened that the Dukes of Mantua and Parma were at variance : by the advice of Cardinal Toledo, *ci-devant* Jesuit, and apparently for the rebels, the pope seized this pretext, and dispatched Aquaviva to the dukes, as papal mediator. What a paltry subterfuge ! Can anything prove more effectually the superiority of the Jesuit Aquaviva over the Pope of Rome ? He obeyed : but of course he did nothing with the dukes ; and as soon as his secretary at Rome notified the turn of affairs and the machinations, he demanded his recall. The mean pope refused. Three months of this harassing exile threw Aquaviva into a violent fever : he could bear it no longer : he returned in spite of the pope, “ recalled by his brethren,” says Cretineau, which is arrant nonsense, unless the *brethren* were superior to the pope—which is likely enough, however. The pope had convoked the General Congregation in spite of Aquaviva’s supreme will to the contrary : horrified, and resolved to the utmost, the general, in his burning fever, rushed to the rescue of his rights invaded.¹

General Congregations were as irksome to the general of the Jesuits, as a convocation of the Church to the pope. If they were sedulously avoided by every other general, how much more were they to be deprecated by Aquaviva, against whom there prevailed such violent hatred. But soon, observing that the arrangement was

¹ Cretineau, iii. 4, 5 ; Ranke, 204.

irrevocable, he composed himself, and said: "We are obedient sons, the will of the Holy Father be done." He then set about his measures.¹

Aquaviva contrived to possess himself of great influence in the elections which deputed the members to the approaching Congregation. It was his good fortune to see many of his most formidable opponents—Mariana for example—rejected even by the Spanish Province.² On the one hand, petitions flocked in to the pope from the discontented, praying for papal intervention against the domination and favouritism of General Aquaviva. "The father general domineered with supreme authority—swaying everything to his will—afraid of nothing—

¹ In a Consulta del Padre Cl. Aquaviva coi suoi padri assistenti, MS. in the Bibl. Corsini, n. 1055, which sets forth the facts of the internal dissensions of the Order, on the whole correctly and in accordance with Mariana's account, Aquaviva is made to give the following statement of a conversation he had with the pope: "S. Stà. disse che io non aveva sufficiente notizia de' soggetti della religione, che io veniva ingannato da falsi delatori, che io mi dimostrava troppo credulo." His Holiness said that, "I was not in possession of sufficient information respecting the members of the Order—that I was deceived by false accusers—that I manifested too much credulity." Again, in the list of causes rendering a congregation necessary, it is said: "Perche molti soggetti di valore, che per non esser conosciuti piu che tanto da' generali, non hanno mai parte alcuna nel governo, venendo a Roma in occasione delle congregazioni sarebbero meglio conosciuti e per conseguenza verrebbero piu facilmente in parte del medesimo governo, senza che questo fosse quasi sempre ristretto a pochi—Because many able men, being but slightly known to the generals, never have any share in the government of the Order, but on coming to Rome to attend the congregations, they would be better known, and consequently could more easily acquire a share in the said government, so that it should no longer be almost invariably confined to a few." These facts attest Mariana's book. They are also given in a memorial presented to Clement VIII., called the *Salutaris admonitio*. The above note is from *Ranke*, p. 204.

² The Jesuit Toledo, or Tolet, was made a cardinal at the very time, apparently for the purpose of giving Aquaviva a rival—at all events, the rebels requested the pope to appoint a cardinal to preside at the Congregation, aiming, of course, at Toledo; and they begged to have Acosta and other malcontents appointed to sit in the Congregation, by papal authority, in spite of the party by which they were excluded.—*Ortelincan*, iii. 6.

terrifying all with his frown—putting down the great and most deserving men of the Company, almost killing them—the public good was sacrificed to private favour.” It was a frightful thing to see “mere boys and dunces—utterly strangers to our Institute preferred to the ancients—the ignorant and incapacitated set before the learned and wise—in short, the bad exalted above the good.” Look at the superiors—“they did what they liked and with impunity—and their office was a perpetuity.” Look at the Company—“all good arts were languishing unto death!”¹

On the other hand, Aquaviva's party bestirred themselves most vigorously. Counter-petitions swarmed round about the papal throne from the provincial Congregations of the Company in Sicily, Germany, Naples, (with numerous signatures), Venice, Belgium, France, Poland, and Austria—all dated in the memorable year 1593—and deprecating the mighty convulsion in the bowels of the Company, stirred to the uttermost by the rebels.² Aquaviva had a party—but he also had a head and a will capable of whelming achievement.

The Congregation assembled: he stood in the midst of his party—his venerable creatures. The battle was

¹ “Patrem Generalem summâ potestate pollere, omnia suo arbitrio administrare, nihil formidare, cunctos nutu terrere, magnos viros et de Societate optimè meritos deprimere, propeque exanimare, bonum publicum sæpè privatâ gratiâ vinci.

“Rudes et tyrones, in nostrisque Institutis peregrinos, antiquis—prudenteribus et doctioribus ignaros et imperitos—melioribus deteriores præfuisse.

“Iisque, qui imperant, omnia collibuisse, atque impunè licere: Imperia diuturna ac penè perpetua esse, nec certa parendi et imperandi spatia constituta esse.

“Ita nobis etiam omnes bonæ artes jam consenscunt.”—*Pro Societate Jesu ad Clementem VIII. P. M. Salutaris Admonitio* in *Merc. Jesuite*, 2nd tome, p. 195, et seq.

² All these supplications are given in the 2nd tome du *Mercure Jesuite*, pp. 203—230.

won : but he flung a halo round about his victorious head by demanding an inquiry into his conduct. Admirable tactic ! Should you be ever doubtful of the result, boldly demand investigation into your conduct—if there be little chance of your black not being declared white by a party-majority. By this step all the world, not in the secret, will sigh forth sympathy towards you in your “wrongs,” and denounce your opponents as unreasonable, unscrupulous, impious rebels—against ecclesiastical and “religious” authority. In the very first sitting Aquaviva declared that since he had the misfortune to labour under the displeasure of some of his brethren, he begged for an inquiry into his conduct before any other business was discussed. A committee was named—the grievances were specified—and he was triumphantly acquitted.¹

The propositions of the General Congregation—the Fifth General Congregation—were then brought forward. Philip II. had objected to several infringements of the laws of the Inquisition by the Jesuits in accordance with their privileges : Aquaviva yielded to the king : they were prohibited by decree. There was another crying abuse, that the Jesuits received the first-born of families, with all their rights to succession, into the Company, without compelling or permitting them to fulfil their vows of poverty by resigning their rights completely : a decree was passed on the subject : the abuse was *not* prohibited—only the consent of the general was necessary for the admission of such subjects : the matter was virtually left in *statu quo*.² The king

¹ When the result was notified to Pope Clement, he bitterly said : “ They were to find a criminal, and they exhibit a saint ! ”—*Cretineau*, iii. 7.

² Dec. v. ; Congreg. xviii.

had recommended other points for consideration. Foremost among them were the questions whether the authority of superiors should be limited to a definite period, and whether a renewal of the General Congregation, after a fixed interval, should not be appointed. These questions aimed at once against the very essence of the Institute—the right of absolute command. Aquaviva stood out. The congregation unanimously—*communi omnium consensu, ac nemine prorsus discrepante*—sided with Aquaviva, and rejected the king's suggestions. But the pope now commanded what had been refused to the king; in his apostolic plenitude of power, he determined that the superiors and rectors of the Order should be changed every three years, and that every six years the General Congregation should be assembled."¹ Vain command to the proud, unflinching general of the Jesuits! At first he may have made a show of certain changes in the officials—but look to the mighty fact, that a General Congregation was not assembled again until fifteen years had rolled away with endless "domestic commotions," and until it was necessary to promulgate stringent decrees against rebels once more—*contra perturbantes*.²

¹ Dec. Cong. V. xxxv. et xxx. By these decrees the contrary was enacted, though the general was vehemently requested not to permit the superiors to remain in office "too long." But before the Congregation separated, the pope sent Cardinal Toledo, quondam Jesuit, to enjoin the triennial termination of the offices.—D. lxiv. Soon after came the command respecting the meeting of the Congregation at the end of every six years—with an injunction that the three assistants for Italy, Spain, and Portugal, should be changed, as they had been in office long enough. They consented to the sexennial Congregation, formally, but resolved to make representations on the subject to the pope—respecting the assistants, they resolved to demur, and seriously to deprecate the execution. Two Jesuits were sent to expostulate—but the pope persisted. "The Congregation acquiesced and nodded (annuit) obedience;" which, however, was never fulfilled. The three assistants were, of course, elected. Dec. lxxiii. lxxiv. lxxvii.

² In 1608. Dec. Cong. VI. ii.

Other decrees, of curious import, were passed in the Fifth Congregation. The Jesuits were forbidden to hold office in the Inquisition ; but they were “seriously and gravely exhorted” to do whatever they could in the service of the “Holy Office and its ministers, “with humility and alacrity.”¹ It was in this Congregation that the high terms of the Jesuit *gratis*-tuition were tariffed, as I have stated in a preceding page ; but the multiplication of colleges was again objected to, like many other abuses—and in like manner, all to no purpose. And it was in this memorable Congregation, that the proposal was made to procure from the Holy See the canonisation of “Ignatius, of holy memory, the founder of our Company : and not only of Father Ignatius, but also of Father Francis Xavier ; and the Congregation charged the general, that should there be solid grounds in the opinion of competent judges for the demand, he might make the request at a convenient time, in the name of the Congregation.”² This is a curious fact. It informs us that, in the year 1593, *the Jesuits themselves formed the design to get Ignatius canonised, and resolved to prosecute the scheme unto achievement.* Well, in the face of this printed decree, the Jesuit biographers tell us that “Pope Paul V., struck with all he heard of Father Ignatius, felt himself impelled to honour him with a special worship, and to cause him to be honoured by all the faithful. . . . He was of opinion they should begin with instituting a juridical inquiry into the life and actions of the servant of God. They, therefore, applied to the work in 1605”—just 12 years after the Jesuits had resolved to machinate the affair unto fulfilment.³

¹ Dec. Cong. V. xxii.

² Dec. lxxi.

³ The method of machination was, besides their universal conversations and

Vain was the proposition against the syndications or spy-system—nothing whatever was to be decreed on *this* subject—*nihil omnino hâc de re statuendum esse*. It was most necessary to good government—*gubernationi bonæ pernecessariam*.¹ In vain a solitary father proposed that the provincials should be required to give an account of their offices every three years—*nihil addendum esse*—the decree must stand as it was.²

In the same congregation it was admitted, that some of the Jesuits undertook worldly affairs, with permission of the superiors : these infringements of the Constitutions were again forbidden, but with the usual and roguish exception, as to when, “in the judgment of the superiors, *charity* should suggest acquiescence.”³ Blessed CHARITY ! How many abuses are brooded beneath thy wings !

suggestions, an annual sermon at the tomb of Ignatius, in laudation of “the saint’s principal actions.” They even got Cardinal Bellarmine to deliver one of these clap-traps in 1599. Baronius was present. And Cardinal Bellarmine “proved that the illustrious deceased, whose eulogium he was delivering, had all that was necessary to give him a place among the saints.” In Bouhours you will find the remainder of this trick as played off on that occasion, ending in a clamour of the Jesuited devotees of Rome, and their immediate worship of Ignatius as a saint “as soon as they knew what *Baronius and Bellarmine had done*” at the tomb of Ignatius ! Oh, ’tis a disgusting thing, this Jesuitism—the soul sickens and the heart grows sad. See *Bouhours, Ignace*, ii. 247—249. It is only justice to Aquaviva to state that he ordered the removal of seven lamps placed by “a devout person” over Loyola’s tomb.—Ib. ¹ Dec. xxxiii. xxxiv.

² Dec. xxxiv. Before the Congregation closed, the pope enjoined this suggestion. Dec. lxiv.

³ Dec. xlviii. State affairs and politics were again most stringently interdicted to the Jesuits, “since amongst various princes our Company is in ill-repute, *perhaps* by the fault, or ambition, or indiscreet zeal of certain members.”—Dec. xlvii. The difficulty was how the Jesuits were to distinguish state affairs or politics in those days from the affairs of “religion,” or the *res Societatis*—the affairs of the Company. But as these learned Jesuits found it excessively difficult in this assembly to define what were the “*essentials*” or “*substantials* of the Institute,” as they called them, we may rest assured that “state affairs” and “politics” were equally undefinable—when the impossibility was expedient.—See Dec. xlv. xlv. lviii.

You may have heard of “*reserved cases* of conscience.” The term means certain crimes not to be absolved by ordinary confessors—but by the bishop, or the pope, or those to whom he afflates the divine authority. Amongst the Jesuits there were many “cases reserved” to the superiors of houses and colleges, for absolution. The object in general is manifold : but amongst the Jesuits it was that the superior should know his men—even by *confession*. A list of the reserved crimes of the Jesuits, at this period of their history, will surprise you. We can scarcely believe our eyes when we find that such crimes as the following were amongst the contingencies of a Jesuit’s conscience. They are *perjury* and bearing *false witness*—*theft*, and the purloining of anything against the vow of poverty, “in that quantity which suffices to make a mortal sin”—voluntary sins of the flesh “issuing into the act external,” or *the* sin in its usual acceptance.¹ What a strange catalogue for the consideration of the children of perfection—Christian perfection—the Companions of —— but the sacred name must not be written : it must be forgotten in such a contemplation.²

¹ Dec. Cong. V. xli.

² Pope Sixtus V. forbade the Jesuits to call themselves the “Company of Jesus.” “Company of Jesus !” he exclaimed, stroking his huge white beard, “What sort of men are these fathers that we must not name them without uncovering our heads ? It is an injury to the other Orders,” he said—“a piece of arrogance which reflects something injurious on the Christ : it is not proper that a name so holy should be pronounced and repeated in discussions by the judges and others at the tribunals.” He permitted them to call themselves Jesuits, but no petitions and intercessions could induce him to revoke the former prohibition. He insisted that Aquaviva himself should draw up the decree, and even to present a formal petition to the Holy See demanding the abolition of the Company’s name ! Aquaviva obeyed : the pope died immediately after ; and Pope Gregory XIV. abrogated the decree, which had no time to be published. “The decease of Sixtus V. happened so opportunely for the Jesuits,” says the historian of the Order, “that in spite of his advanced age, his past fatigues, and

Stern and relentless were now the decrees against the admission of converted Jews and Moors into the Company. It was a scandal to the prejudiced Spaniards; and although Christ said, Come to me, *all*—and though God excepts to no man existing on account of his race—yet said the Jesuits: “Though we may be satisfied with a man as to himself, still he may be disagreeable to us on account of what he has inherited from his fathers.”¹ Not even the general was now to “dispense” with the decree against the tainted Christian: the law was now to be inviolable—until some rich Jew-Christian or Morisco pricked them with a hard temptation.²

Jews and
Moors ex-
cluded by
the Jesuits.

What an awful time is the time of suspense 'twixt the victory of a party or a partisan-sovereign, and the

the mortal malady which he had endured so long, people saw in his death a human intervention” [that is, he was supposed to be poisoned]. “The origin of the report is as follows,” continues Cretineau: “When Aquaviva left the Quirinal he went to the noviciate of St. Andrew, and ordered the novices to begin a nine days’ prayer to fend the storm which menaced the Company of Jesus. The novena began, and on the ninth day, at the instant when the bell of St. Andrew summoned the novices to the litanies, Sixtus V. expired. To the present day, when a pope is dangerously ill, and the bell of a Jesuit-church sounds to prayers for the dying, the Romans say: ‘The holy father is going to die—the bell of the Jesuits is sounding the litanies.’”—ii. 350, *et seq.* Leti says the pope was credibly supposed to be poisoned; but by the Spaniards.—iii. 466. Ranke says nothing of the poison, but mentions the storm which burst over the Quirinal when the pope breathed his last. “The stupid multitude persuaded themselves that Fra Felice [the pope] had made a compact with the devil, by whose help he had climbed from step to step, and that now, on the expiry of the stipulated time, his soul was fetched away in the midst of the tempest. In this way they symbolised their dissatisfaction at the many new *taxes he had imposed*, and the doubts as to his perfect *orthodoxy*, which had been so often agitated of late years.” All his statues were pulled down in a fit of tumultuous rage, as at the death of Paul IV.—*Ranke*, 185.

¹ Tellez, p. 439. “Bem pôde acontecer a contentarnos hum homem pelo que tem de sy, e desagradarnos pelo que herdou de seus Pays.” He is referring to *Polancus*, if you remember, who was debarred the generalate by his *taint*.

² Dec. Cong. V. lii. Members were even to be expelled if found thus to be tainted.—*Ib.*

punishment of the vanquished ! *Væ victis*—woe to the vanquished fell shattering on the rebel-Jesuits. The commands of the pope in their favour—however futile—sharpened the edge of resentment. The times in which Lainez found himself similarly situated, were past :—there was now no need of expedient forbearance. After enforcing every item that the reforming Jesuits denounced—in the fifty-fourth decree of the Congregation a solemn thunderbolt was hurled at the rebels—the “prevaricators,” the “disturbers,” the “architects of novelties,” the “*degenerate* sons of our Order,” who had dared to write memorials to the pontiff, signed with these words—*Ita petit tota Societas—thus demands the whole Company*.¹ “Wherefore, the Congregation declares that such men, the authors of such great evils, the seducers of others, and their accomplices, have incurred all the censures and penalties contained in the Apostolic bulls. Further, it decrees that all of them, as the authors of the most serious division in the Company, shall be forthwith expelled from the whole Company as a pestilence—leaving it to the *general* to decide whether they should be castigated with peculiar penances before they are dismissed !” What a gnashing of teeth were these bitter words calculated to produce in the fallen Luthers of the Ignatians ! If with their own they did thus, what might not be expected from them when externs, when heretics were obnoxious to their high displeasure ? Nor was that all. “But if, through any necessary impediments, they cannot be forthwith expelled from the Company, the Congregation has resolved that they shall be deprived of all office and dignity whatever, neither having a vote nor capable of receiving one—as

¹ Dec. liv.

long as it shall be necessary to retain them in the Company." It must be remembered that most of the general's opponents were enjoying high favour in Spain with Philip II., and the nobility :—this fact made the general and his party somewhat considerate in their ferocious vengeance. The decree proceeds to declare that those who have been "vehemently suspected of having a share in the said machinations," must swear an oath that they will humbly accept the bulls confirmatory of the Institute, and will never infringe them again, nor attempt innovation for the future : "should they refuse to take this oath, or should not keep it when taken, they must be utterly expelled, although they be professed and ancient members of the Company." A general order was by the same decree issued "in virtue of holy obedience," enjoining every member to denounce the perturbators, for the future, to the general,—who was to inflict the merited chastisement, and expel them from the Company—"convinced that unless he did so effectually, he would not consult the good of the Company—for which he ought to be ready to pour out his blood—nor satisfy his conscience." Lastly, "that this enactment may have issue without impediment, the Congregation decrees that a request be made to our most holy Lord Clement, in the name of the whole Order, that, following the example of his predecessors, he may vouchsafe to ratify in our Institute what they confirmed and ratified, and assist the same with his authority and power, so that the penalties which have been sanctioned in this decree against those perverse men may be ordered into execution without impediment."¹ But they were sadly disappointed. Clement VIII.—to his

¹ Dec. liv.

honour be it recorded — refused to pipe to their vengeance.¹ Neither confirmation nor ratification did these *abusive* aristocrats get for their intended “execution.” They might imprison and otherwise plague and punish the rebels—but it was in accordance with their “privileges”—thus suffered the unquenchable Mariana, —but they durst not expel that mighty Spaniard from his country’s Company. One of the black sheep, Henriquez, was summoned before the council of the loyal professi. He had composed a work which he was forbidden to publish. During the rebellion, in which he took an active part in Portugal, he boldly published the book in spite of Aquaviva’s prohibition—and continued to write his “Sum of Moral Theology”—a bank of “probable opinions” tending to do away with conscience, and to supply its place with “a phantom and a lie.” Unquestionably the Jesuit deserved punishment: but the royal council of Spain and the Inquisition upheld him in his disobedience. Still he appeared before the loyal council of the professi. They tried to soften the proud and headstrong Jesuit into submission. Like a true Jesuit, he clutched his opinions—refused to submit—and claimed the privilege of leaving the Company to enter the Order of St. Dominic.² Aquaviva consented, and the Congregation ended its sessions in January, 1594—leaving the fermentation of discontentment in tenfold energy throughout the Company. In truth, there was no wonder that the Jesuits tempested the

¹ Clement VIII. gave the Jesuits only a *breve* and an “extension”—the former in 1595, which prohibited our men from using an obsolete privilege by which they carried their “reserved cases” to any confessor they pleased. The “extension” was in 1602, and had reference to the confraternities of the Jesuits, which “faculty” he enlarged to the Jesuit “residences,” at the request of the general.

² Cretineau, iii. 9, *et seq.*

world, since they were restless furies amongst themselves—united only when enemies were to be crushed, or presumptuous mortals dared to shoot arrows against the solar orb of the Company, culminating though she was amid clouds, thunder, and lightning.

Men wonder at Jesuit-pertinacity in the Company's machinations against a resisting world. We find it difficult to conceive the force of motive which impelled the Jesuits in their efforts. There are even critics who find in this element of Jesuitism, something like a proof of its sterling merit; but the devil himself claims, and must be allowed the same "bad eminence." Indifferent to the object, agitation was all they cared for; antagonism was the result of their very existence. Any motive was sufficient to arouse the desperate efforts of the Jesuits. And they still pursued Aquaviva—implacable—resolved to vanquish their general in his triumph.

Jesuit pertinacity.

Finding that they were backed at Rome and in the Escorial, by Pope Clement and King Philip, the agitators held to their design of removing Aquaviva from Rome and the generalate of the Company. A coincidence, as usual, was made subservient to their purpose. The Archbishop of Naples died—and the agitators "circumvented Pope Clement VIII. They morally compelled him to nominate Aquaviva to the vacant see."¹ The Jesuits themselves announce this astonishing fact, or it might be considered an "idle tale." And yet, did not Father *Ignatius* bequeath them the example? Did *he* not get Melchior Cano made bishop of the Canaries to "get rid of" the troublesome enemy?² The Duke of Sussa,

The agitators renew the attack.

¹ Cretineau, iii. 10.

² See vol. i. 380, of the present work.

Philip's ambassador at Rome, made the same demand in behalf of his master, the patron of all rebels but his own, and, therefore, of the Jesuit-agitators, who, however just were their denouncements against the corrupt government of the general, and abuses of the company, forfeited all claim to support by the grovelling method they adopted to promote their enterprise. This is enough to stamp the enterprise with the disgusting seal of selfishness. Aquaviva was deaf to the soft impeachment. He saw through the flimsy veil at once. Was it likely that *he* should not say *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*? Perhaps they fancied that his ambition or self-love would be resistlessly tempted—and so it was, but its object was the generalate of the Company of Jesus—and ten thousand annoyances and vile tricks now made him more resolved than ever to *vanquish*—to *beat down* all opposition from pope, king, and their fostered rebels. In this fine moment of his career, I bend in admiration of this renowned Jesuit—ininitely superior to all his little, grovelling opponents, whom he must have inwardly spurned with that unspeakable scorn which every feeling of the heart—every nerve and muscle of the frame vibrate at the cowardly meanness of those who, without the courage to assassinate, resort to poison. Aquaviva would not be made an archbishop :—the attempt was a failure.¹

What was now to be done by these pertinacious Jesuits? Resign the field? Bite their nails and keep their vow of obedience? Think of *Ad majorem*
Another attempt. and preach salvation to the wicked world around? Not the least in the world: they actually resolved to seize Aquaviva—to lay violent hands on their general

¹ Cretineau, iii. 10.

and deliver him up to the fatuous King of Spain, Philip III., who had just succeeded to his *unfortunate* father! Again I say, this is no "idle tale,"—but a *true* Jesuit-fact, and no invention.¹ And here an explanation—a *dénouement* is necessary. Aquaviva was never favourable to the League or Spanish faction in France. His politics tended to the contrary direction. I have stated facts which attest at least his neutrality in that disgusting affair. By this conduct Aquaviva was an indirect enemy of Spain. The Court of Spain believed him opposed to its policy; and the Duke of Lerma, the royal minister and favourite, advised the young king to join the conspiracy against Aquaviva. Philip complied. The Jesuit-scheme of seizure was concocted, and Philip gave the initiative. He wrote to the pope, stating that in order to remedy the abuses signalised by the Jesuits in their Company, and to restore concord amongst the various religious communities in Spain, it was necessary that Aquaviva should undertake a visitation over the Peninsula. Such was the villanous representation to the pope—and the Jesuit Ferdinand Mendoza was the Judas appointed, or rather, who formed the project, to betray his master.²

Clement VIII. co-operated in the design. To cloak the villany, he made Bellarmine a cardinal with a most flattering compliment—"as a man of learning unequalled in the Church." In vain both Bellarmine and Aquaviva protested against the dignity, which the Jesuits swore not to receive. The pope persisted—"hoping, by this exaltation of a

The pope promotes the baseness.

¹ Cretineau, iii. 10.

² "Le Jesuite Ferdinand de Mendoza forma le projet de le livrer à Philippe III. d'Espagne."—*Cretineau*, iii. 10.

member, to present the voyage of the general under a more favourable aspect.”¹ Whilst villany was thus patronised by the head of the Church, can we wonder that the members everywhere wandered in quest of “probable opinions” to construct new consciences for mankind, to make straight the diabolically crooked ways of the human heart? It may be asked what proof is there that Clement knew the object of the king’s request? And we may ask, is it at all likely that he was ignorant of it—considering all that we have read—the whole bearing of the vile affair? Besides, it is admitted that Clement “hoped to present the voyage of Aquaviva under a more favourable aspect.” “No one,” says Cretineau, “made slight of the serious requisition. The general of the Jesuits seemed to be abandoned by the pope. Henry IV. of France, Sigismund, King of Poland, and the majority of the Catholic princes, did not desert the general. Spanish policy triumphed already in the expected captivity of Aquaviva.”

The other potentates opposed it, induced by a sentiment of justice, or by policy. It required nothing less than the death of Clement VIII., which happened in 1605, to reduce all these projects to nothing.² What a strange extrication from a dread dilemma! ’Twixt disobedience to the pope, and destruction or worse captivity by his enemies! Would Aquaviva have submitted to the pope and his enemies?

How the general escaped.

¹ “Esperant par cette élévation présenter le voyage du Père Aquaviva sous un jour plus favorable.”—*Cretineau*, iii. 12.

² Soprapreso da una gagliarda convulsione di humori—he lingered three weeks, “reciting psalms and going through all his other devotions with the greatest piety and religion,” and died on the 3rd of March, 1605.—*Vite de’ Pontef.* p. 691, *et seq.* Another account says, “Soprapreso d’una *concussione* d’humori.”—*Conclavi de’ Pontefici*, p. 444. According to D’Ossat, Clement was subject to the gout.—*Lettres*, ii. 521, ad Ann. 1597, 19 Mars.

Would he have yielded to the fate so vilely concocted ? I believe not. He would have found an outlet from the hideous Caudine forks of his worse than Samnite enemies. I lament the death of this pope, because it has denied to history one more example of villany defeated. It would have been glorious to see this elastic Jesuit bursting his bonds like a new Samson, in the toils of the skulking Spanish Philistines, to whom he was basely betrayed. On the other hand, what are we to think of these most opportune papal departures ? Was it another *novena* that rang Clement VIII., like Sixtus V., out of life, at the very moment when his death was a blessing to Aquaviva and his party in the Company of Jesus ? And the thing is still more mysterious when we read that Clement “was surprised by a strong convulsion, or concussion, of humours”—a malady not to be found catalogued in the nosologies, although worthy of a place in the martyrologies—assuming the pope to have been killed by a Jesuit-novena.

Simultaneously with these disgraceful proceedings on the part of the agitators and their political abettors, the Jesuit theologians were waging desperate war with the Dominicans. I have before declared and proved, that among the Jesuits there was no fixed and defined system of scholastic theology. St. Thomas was the watchword as far as he was *expedient* : but they answered to every other precisely with the same intention. Even in this Fifth Congregation this is virtually asserted. “They were not to think that they were so bound to the opinions of St. Thomas, as not at all to be allowed to depart from them : even the Thomists themselves—yea, the greatest Thomists—avow that they do so ; therefore, it is but fair that Our Men should not be

bound to St. Thomas, any more than the Thomists themselves.”¹ At first the Jesuits adhered to the doctrinal system of the Thomists, generally prevalent in the schools of that day. Ignatius, or the Constitutions, had expressly imposed upon the disciples, the doctrines of the angelic doctor. Soon, however, as the field of operation enlarged, as events opened an interminable world of discussion before them, they began to think that this angelic doctor, though he might suit the wicked, but unenlightened, paradise of which he was the oracle, was little better than the Ass of Balaam in the equally wicked, but enlightened, fallen world of controversy. Intellect had advanced, although morality, or, rather, *immorality*, was a fixture. It was incumbent on the interesting novelties—the Jesuits—to soar above the beggarly beaten track of the sainted doctor, however angelical. The Jesuits were independent in life: they would be independent in doctrine. St. Thomas was a production of the Dominicans: let the Dominicans expound his opinions. The Jesuits would respect his oracles as far as the said oracles sang the same tune as they themselves so beautifully hummed or whistled; but they claimed the right and the capacity to invent and expatiate in a few delightful variations. But, in point of fact, the angelic doctor had no right to complain any more than all the blessed fathers of the Roman Church. At least, so it was thought at the end of the sixteenth century; and I believe no belief could possibly be better founded. In a work, entitled *The Chief Heads of the Doctrines of the Jesuits*, published in 1580—only forty years after their establishment—you will find, as I have before stated, that the Jesuits ran counter to

¹ Dec. v. Congr. lvi.

Tertullian, Chrysostom, Augustin, Jerome, Athanasius, Lactantius, Basil, Cyril, Irenæus, and Origen—in point of fact, to everything in the shape of the “Fathers,” and, by way of a *coup de grâce*, to the Bible itself. This last objection is the least surprising, because the Bible is such an open book, that the many hundred sects calling themselves Christian—however conflicting among themselves—boldly appeal to the Bible for their doctrines. Amongst whom would the Redeemer dwell at the present day? Amongst those whose sincere uprightness is *not* the result of *human theology*. We have also seen, in a preceding page, that the Jesuits objected to swear to teach the exact Catholic doctrine of the Council of Trent, which is, perhaps, the most startling feature of Jesuit independence.¹ The Jesuits had already given many tokens of this independence: Lainez himself was regarded with suspicion by the cast-iron Spanish Inquisition;² and the free turn of thought prominently evident in the Jesuits had been often a subject of remark to the same detestable Argus. Now, in 1584, General Aquaviva openly advanced these sentiments in the famous *Ratio Studiorum*, or Rule of Studies in the Company of Jesus, published with his sanction, permission, and authority—precisely as they were repeated and enforced in the Fifth Congregation, in 1593-4, as I

¹ Lest it be forgotten, I shall quote the “designation” once more, from amongst the passages selected from the Council of Trent, by the Third Congregation, “as appearing clearly repugnant to our constitutions, privileges, and our usual mode of action.” Here is the passage:—“Ad normam Decretorum Synodi, Magistri, Doctores, et alii in Universitatibus ea quæ Catholicæ fidei sunt doceant; seque ad hoc institutum initio cujuslibet anni solenni juramento abstringant.”—*Sess. xxv. c. 2.* “These are passages of the Council of Trent manifestly repugnant to our laws and the customs of our Company.” Such is the declaration immediately following the passages, of which the above is the last of the most repugnant.—*Corpus. Instit. Soc. Jesu, i. 815.*

² Llorente, iii. 83.

have quoted—a proud repetition of a decree which gave the initiative to a terrible battle among the venerable heads, fairly overcharged with the remnants from the “dens and shades of death—a universe of death.” At the apparent depreciation of their oracular and angelical doctor, up stood the mighty Dominicans, “with shuddering horror pale, and eyes aghast.” It was “a lamentable lot.” They “found no rest.” A “fiery alp” emerged in the midst of that astonishing Christendom, which was the Catholicism of the sixteenth century. The Dominicans pronounced the *Ratio Studiorum* of the Jesuits to be the most audacious, presumptuous, dangerous book of its kind, and if its suggestions were put in practice, they would cause infinite damage and disturbance in the Christian republic. Both the king and the pope were assailed with remonstrances on the subject.¹ In the very midst of this strong feeling against the independent notions of the Jesuits, *Unus è Societate*—one of the Company threw St. Thomas overboard whilst sailing on the vast, interminable ocean of “fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute:”—the Jesuit Molina published a work—*De Concordiâ Gratiæ et Liberi Arbitrii*—*On the Agreement of Grace and Free Will*. It became at once the source of the most grating discord amongst the children of grace, and the whole contest for very many years proved beyond contradiction, that if the free will of controversial churchmen once finds an audience, it will arouse a war as graceless as

¹ “Y dado a censurar, fue dicho por aquellos que aquel libro era el mas peligroso, temerario, y arrogante que jamas havia salido in semejante materia, y que si se metia en pratica lo que contenta, causaria infinitos daños y alboratos en la republica christiana.”—*Pegna in Serry; et apud Ranke*, 205. Pope Sixtus V prohibited the use of the *Ratio Studiorum*, which was published in 1584. Aquaviva published another edition in 1590 and 1594.—*Artes Jesuit.* p. 3, et seq.

that described by Milton, which ended in the loss of Paradise.

“ O shame to men ! devil with devil damn'd
Firm *concord* holds—men only disagree,
Of creatures rational, though under hope
Of heavenly *grace*.”

“Throughout the whole range of theology,” says Ranke, “Catholic, as well as Protestant, the questions respecting grace and merits, free will and predestination, were still the most exciting:—they still continually occupied the minds, the erudition, and the speculative powers of clergy and laity. On the Protestant side, the majority were at this period in favour of Calvin’s rigid doctrine of God’s special decrees, according to which some were foredoomed to everlasting blessedness, and others to damnation. The Lutherans, with their milder notions, were at a disadvantage, and sustained losses in sundry quarters. On the Catholic side, an opposite course of opinion took place. Whenever any leaning towards the notions of even the mildest Protestant, or even a more rigid construction of St. Augustin’s expositions, was apparent, it was combated and put down. The Jesuits evinced especial zeal in this matter. They defended, against every bias towards the abjured and abandoned system, that body of doctrine which had been set up in the Council of Trent on the subject, and which, moreover, had been established in part through the influence of their brethren Lainez and Salmeron. And even this system was not always enough to content their polemical zeal.” Ranke gives a clear and candid exposition of Molina’s views, whose object is to explain the difficulties of the subject in a novel manner. “His principal design was to vindicate for man’s free will a

still wider sphere of action than was admitted by the doctrines of St. Thomas or of Trent. At Trent the work of salvation had been declared to be based chiefly on the inherent righteousness of Christ, which, being infused into us, excites love, leads to all virtues and good works, and finally produces justification. Molina goes an important step further. He maintains that free will can, without the help of grace, produce morally good works; that it can resist temptation; that it can elevate itself to various acts of hope, faith, charity, and repentance.¹ When a man has advanced thus far, then, as he asserts, God, for the sake of Christ's merits, accords him grace:² by this grace he experiences the supernatural operations of sanctification; but even in the reception of this grace, and with regard to its growth, free will continues, as before, incessantly active. Everything, in fact, depends on it: it rests with ourselves to make God's grace effectual or the reverse. Justification rests upon the union of the will and of grace—they are bound together like two men rowing in the same boat. It is manifest that Molina could not admit the notion of predestination, as entertained by Augustine or Thomas Aquinas. He considers it too stern and cruel. He will

¹ "The *concursus generalis Dei*, or general co-operation of God is always presupposed; but by that is meant no more than the natural condition of free will, which certainly is not what it is without God. 'Deus semper præsto est per concursum generalem libero arbitrio, ut naturaliter velit aut nolit prout placuerit.' 'Pretty nearly in the same way Bellarmine identifies natural and divine law, because God is the author of nature.'"

² "This grace he also explains very naturally," says Ranke: 'Dum homo expendit res credendas . . . per notitias concionatoris aut aliunde comparatas, influit Deus in easdem notitias influxu quodam particulari quo cognitionem illam adjuvat.'—*Disput.* 54. 'Whilst a man weighs matters of belief . . . collected from the discourses of a preacher, or from other sources, God's influence enters in some special manner into those means of information whereby the perception in question is assisted.'"

own no other predestination than such as is, properly, foreknowledge. God, from his omniscient insight into the nature of each man's will, knows beforehand what each will do in any contingency, even though it be in his power to do the contrary. But a thing does not occur by reason of the fact that God foresees it : on the contrary, God foresees it because it will occur. This was a doctrine assuredly most directly opposed to that of Calvin : it was, at the same time, the first that undertook to rationalise this mystery, if we may so speak. It is intelligible, acute, and superficial, and therefore it could not fail of a certain success. It may be compared with the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, which the Jesuits produced about the same period.”¹

This doctrine of the Jesuit Molina was opposed to that of St. Thomas and his Dominicans : consequently the monks set upon Molina and his party with all the zeal that should be displayed against confirmed and condemned heretics by the hounds of orthodoxy. But the fact is, that politics were at the bottom of the agitation, as far as the patrons of the contest were concerned. The Jesuits were hated in Spain at the present time, on account of Aquaviva's manifest leaning towards Henry IV. of France. As Aquaviva's party was now the great majority of the Company, the Spaniards denounced the order as heretical, in punishment for its present political inclination. In fact, so purely political was the real substance of the affair, that the discontented Jesuits sided with the Dominicans : Henriquez and Mariana openly censured the doctrines of Molina. We have thus exhibited a curious feature in the Company of Jesus at this period. Within half a dozen years expelled

¹ Ranke, 205.

from France for leaning towards Spain — and now denounced in Spain for leaning towards France. This last effect was the result of Aquaviva's management. For Spain he had no sympathy : to France he looked, and not erroneously, with hopes the most ardent. Lastly, there was another faction in the Company, which was sworn to promote the interests of Spain, namely, the English Jesuits, headed by Parsons.¹ Meanwhile, however, the religious rancour of the contest lost nothing in intensity by its political bearing. Aquaviva and his assistants were for Molina : this was enough to stir up the opposition of the Company's agitators. The vast majority of the Jesuits ranged in like manner with their general : this was sufficient to rouse the Dominicans against the Company, whose prospects at that time, in spite of domestic commotion, were the most glorious imaginable. A public disputation between the Dominicans and the Jesuits on Molina's views ended bitterly, as might be expected ;—nothing more was wanted to effectuate an implacable enmity between the two parties : henceforward *Molinism*, or the doctrine of Molina, was to be the excuse for the most suicidal machinations that have ever exhibited to the world the ghastliness of Rome. The quarrel set the whole Catholic world in agitation—both on account of the doctrines in question,

¹ “ With regard to the dispute between the Dominicans and Jesuits,” says Du Perron, writing to Henry IV. in 1606, “ I will apprise your Majesty as soon as the pope has come to a decision. The Spaniards openly protect the Dominicans, in hatred, as I believe, of the affection evinced towards your Majesty by the Father General of the Jesuits, and almost all his Company, excepting those dependant on Fathers Mendoça and Parsons, particularly the English Jesuits ; and it seems that they wish to make a state-quarrel out of a religious dispute : but his holiness will know how to discern one interest from the other, and to adjudge the truth to those to whom it belongs.”—*Ambassades et Negociations du Card. du Perron*, 430, ed. Paris, 1623.

and the respective champions with their partisans. If it was really a *misfortune* for the Jesuits to be violently opposed (and I am decidedly of the contrary opinion) it is curious to note its origin in their time-serving, place-serving expediency. With party-purposes they debited specious arguments for the "sovereignty of the people" and in defence of "regicide"—with the intention of promoting the interests of Spain and of the popedom. When Henry IV.'s victories and bribes captivated the French parliamentarians, universitarians, and other churchmen, these doctrines became the legitimate excuse for denouncing the Company, especially as the Jesuits of the Spanish faction bestirred themselves in accordance with their doctrines, directly or indirectly. The political Aquaviva saw the disadvantage of his own game with that system of tactics, and resolved to side effectually with the triumphant reaction in France; and there cannot be a doubt that it was merely policy which prevented the Jesuits from at once siding with Henry IV. At first it would have been to yield a great certainty for a very small uncertainty—Spain and her world-encircling colonies, Rome and papal omnipotence, for France and a very uncertain monarchy—obnoxious at any moment, as the Jesuits knew full well, to the knife of the assassin. But now, when the crafty and valiant Huguenot had secured his throne—when it was evident that the French monarchy must rapidly advance as an European dynasty, whilst Spain was retrograding—when it was manifest that the pope himself was being frightened into alliance with Henry IV.—then the astute general knew that he could freely worship the rising sun, so as to get warmed by some of those rays which had so deeply penetrated the parliamentarians, universitarians,

and other churchmen of France. Of course there was still enough of the Spanish faction in the Company, to deprecate royal Spanish vengeance against the *Order*. Considering all these points, you will at once perceive the drift of those vile machinations of Spain against Aquaviva. We shall soon see the perfect success of Aquaviva's policy with Henry IV., combined, however, with the Huguenot's own craft and finesse.

The pope's grant of absolution to Henry was a motive for concession on the part of the king, thus secured from the hand of the assassin, and secret machination. The expulsion of the Jesuits was borne by Aquaviva most admirably; and whilst the Jesuits were still inveterately and excusably hostile to the party which promoted their expulsion, they abstained from displaying any irritation or aversion towards the king. Even the Jesuit Commolet, who had exclaimed from the pulpit that an Ehud was needed to rid France of the tyrant, had changed his mind when he came to Rome, and declared himself in favour of the king's absolution. Amongst all the cardinals none contributed so much to the grant of absolution as did the Jesuit Toledo—"he performed wonders in the matter, and showed himself a good Frenchman," says the diplomatist Du Perron. It must be admitted that nothing could surpass the wisdom of this policy. And the persevering Jesuits—with Aquaviva at their head—pursued the policy in spite of the fresh resolutions passed against them by the French parliament. True, the general remonstrated, but he betrayed no violence, no intemperate zeal. Nay, the Jesuits who remained in France now declared for the king, exhorted the people to be faithful and to love him. Doubtless this was Aquaviva's command:

but not even the exhibition of loyalty would he intemperately press:—some of the Jesuits were beginning to make their way back to the places they had left: Aquaviva did not approve of this impatience: he enjoined them to wait for the king's permission. He took good care that both facts should be made known to Henry,—whereat the king was, of course, highly delighted, and actually thanked the general in special letters.¹ Then the Jesuit Richeome, styled the French Cicero, composed a popular apology for the order, which he published. It is said to have appeared particularly convincing to the king, but his approbation was probably intended merely to give the thing vogue, as a preparation for the transaction he was cunningly meditating. The publisher of the book was arrested by a decree of the parliament, as the contents were, by that party, considered hostile to the royal authority and the parliament. The Jesuits had first given it circulation in the south of France. Full well was Henry aware that France could not be effectually “evacuated” of the Jesuits. His southern provinces, at least—those nearest the hated Spaniards—were constantly under the influence of the Jesuits. All over France they had partisans.² Would it not be

¹ “But they soon forgot this lesson,” writes Henry himself to D'Ossat in 1601. “They have gone to Cahors, where they have begun a college—without my permission—a fact which has renewed the remembrance of my old wounds. I have ordered them to be put out of the said town.”—*Lettres du Card. D'Ossat*, t. ii. 21, 22, ed. 1698; *Coudrette*, i.

² Writing to Beaumont, ambassador in England in 1603, Henry says: “What has hindered me from treating the Jesuits with severity, is chiefly that they are a body and an order at present powerful in Christendom, being composed of many persons of intellect and learning who have obtained great credit and power amongst the Catholics. In persecuting and driving them to despair of preservation in my kingdom, I should have directly leagued against myself many superstitious discontented minds, a great number of Catholics, and have given them some pretext for rallying together, and for executing new projects

better to try and make friends of those who were determined to haunt his kingdom, either as acknowledged friends or proscribed enemies? If it was bad enough as it was, or seemed to be, should he not at least try to improve the prospect? He had granted the Edict of Nantes to the Huguenots, investing them with all the privileges, or rather the rights, which they certainly merited at the hands of their king, to whom they exhibited so much devotedness that they permitted him to conform to the papal ceremonies to secure his crown. But clamours arose on all sides against the "insolence" of these favoured Huguenots. Petitions and representations were not wanting. Read the immense *Remontrance Chrétienne*, addressed to Henry IV., "by Matthieu de Lannoy, priest of Jesus Christ in his Church, and Doctor in Theology"—in the year 1601. Every possible argument that the blackest bigotry can invent is therein forced on the king, to induce him to undertake the Catholic cause with vigour and effect. If the Huguenots permitted the king to conform to Romanism, in the hope that it was only a temporary expedient,—how could he count on their fidelity now that it was so manifest that he could not possibly retrograde from that compromise? Was it not expedient to strengthen the party to which he was irrevocably bound? In the apparent prostration of the Catholic

of rebellion in my kingdom, &c. . . . I have also considered, that in giving the Jesuits some hope of being recalled and reunited in my kingdom, I would divert and hinder them from yielding themselves to the ambitious desires of the King of Spain. In this I was not wrong, for many of them have sought my goodwill, favour, and protection, with declarations and protestations of all affection, obedience, &c. . . . so that I found I could make them useful and satisfactory on many occasions, as well on my own account as for my neighbours and friends, against whom the Spaniards have often employed the men of the said Company, &c., 15 Aug. 1603."—*Apud Coudrette*, i. 328.

cause (for his accession was the triumph of Protestantism) was not the Protestant party rising to a dangerous preponderance—which might give him trouble hereafter? And in the midst of such reflections, the croaking fanatics of the land filled his ears with lamentations on the ruin of the Catholic cause, which he had sworn to uphold, to defend, and to promote. And many were the voices calling for the Jesuits. Their congregations, confraternities, sodalities, were made to send forth a piteous chorus of dolorous intonations whose burthen was : *Bring back the Jesuits*. Amongst the endless complaints in the Christian Remonstrance alluded to, their mouthpiece said to Henry IV., “ But what can we say of the continued exile of the very pious and very learned fathers of the Company of the name of Jesus, and their very Christian schools, wherein literature and piety are united, are associated, and constitute an excellent arsenal well fortified with all virtues and all sorts of spiritual arms, to fight the monster of Huguenotry—to strike him down—to cut off and to crush all other similar infernal armies of impiety? Satan could not endure in France those powerful warriors, the instruments, the organs of the Holy Ghost—for he felt their blows too vigorous and too heavy to bear : he saw they were armed with the corslet of justice, proof against his fiery darts, and had in hand the sword of the Spirit to pierce him through, to break and mollify the sharpest, the strongest points of the arguments of his ministers, and render them as dumb as fishes—*muets comme des poissons*. In fact, they tremble, not only in the presence of these good priests of the Church of Jesus Christ, but even at the sound of their name.”¹ The

¹ Remonstrance Chrétienne, p. 378, ed. Bruxelles, 1601. Amidst a heap of
VOL. III. E

pope was "in continual fear" of the concessions made to the heretics: Henry was anxious "to overturn the designs of the ambitious and the factious, who were striving to irritate the Huguenots against the Catholics."¹ Father Lorenzo Maggio was sent by Aquaviva, to assure the king with solemn oaths, of the fidelity of the Company:—"Should it turn out otherwise, let himself and his brethren be held the blackest of traitors;"² and the king resolved to make friends of the Jesuits.³ There were Jesuits around him—among the rest, the famous Father Cotton, whom Henry appointed his confessor, in the place of his usual "director;"⁴ the dismissal is very bunglingly accounted for by the royal courtier, Philippe Herault, who, nevertheless, tells us that Henry's queen was forced to connive at her husband's *liaison* with the Marquise de Verneuil, at the very time in question—and the Jesuit did the same, for he shrived the king in his "devotions at the jubilee of Orleans," immediately after his appointment in 1601; and the self-

the most rancorous abuse and denunciation of the Huguenots, take the following cool observation: "They have made and still make a great noise about the massacre of St. Bartholomew in 1572. I have always had great horror of the violent effusion of blood without reason and justice: but of that massacre we may say that it was an execution of justice, *although its form was somewhat extraordinary, not however without a precedent in similar cases*" (!) p. 234. There is very little probability that Henry IV. bothered himself with reading such rubbish, but his subjects read it, and he could not fail to see the effects. Having prevaricated in conforming to Romanism with the motives he had, nothing remained for him to do but to make the most of his new party, which he resolved accordingly.

¹ Lettres du Card. D'Ossat, iii. 509, 524, 525.

² Sully, livre xvii. 307.

³ When Father Maggio saw that Henry was slower than was expected in the matter of his Company's recall in spite of the promise, he said to the king jocosely, "Your Majesty is slower than women who produce their fruit in nine months." "Kings are not brought to bed so easily as women," retorted Henry to the Jesuit, whose wit and good humour were Aquaviva's motive for sending him to the humorous monarch.—*De Thou*.

⁴ René Benoit. According to Grégoire, he abdicated the appointment by reason of old age and fatigue.—*Confesseurs des Rois*, 315.

same Jesuit continued to absolve the king as long as he lived, notwithstanding his most disgusting, scandalous, and *unmanly* profligacy.¹ Perhaps the Jesuit's predecessor in the wretched appointment began to get scrupulous at the inveterate profligacy of the royal "penitent." It was Henry's belief that "power and domestic example permitted him to love both a wife and a mistress at the same time"—*qu'il estait fondé en pouvoir et exemple domestique d'aymer et une femme et une maistresse tout ensemble*,—says the courtier Philippe Herault. If this appointment of the Jesuit Cotton over the king's conscience was meant as a preliminary, nothing could be more significant of the very purely political motives, which induced Henry IV. to recall the Jesuits into France. He wrote a comely letter (one of his accomplishments), to Aquaviva, intimating his "heartly anxiety to consummate the re-establishment." His resolution was signified to the parliament: they resolved to remonstrate: Henry threatened to affront the bearer of the remonstrance, should it be presented. They took the hint: but Achille de Harlay, at the head of the magistrates, delivered a very feeling remonstrance

¹ "Ne voulant cependant obmettre ce que je sçay que les historiens du temps n'auront conneu ou n'auront remarqué, qui est qu'un des principaux soins qu'eust le roy quand la reyne fust arrivée à Paris, fust de luy presenter et faire veoir la marquise de Verneuil et luy faire agréer sa compaignée ordinaire; et ce fust lors que la reyne eust beaucoup de peyne de s'accommoder à cela; neantmoins estant parfaitement bonne et desireuse de complaire au roy en tout, elle vescu très courtoisement et favorisa de bon visage, et de tous autres tesmoignages d'amitié, laditte marquise plus que autre dame de la cour, et mesme se contraignist jusques-là de ne tesmoigner aucuns mescontentemens de l'amour très apparent que le roi tesmoignait à laditte marquise, ny de la veoir logée comme elle et avec elle dans le Louvre, disant qu'elle estoit prou satisfaite et assurée de l'affection du roy en son endroiet, et que pour rien du mond elle ne vouloit traverser ses plaisirs, &c. &c.; car le roi croyoit qu'il estoit fondé en pouvoir et exemple domestique d'aymer et une femme et une maistresse tout ensemble."—*Mem. de Phil. Herault*, Ann. 1601; (*Pantheon. Litt.* 384.)

to the king against the admission of the Jesuits. His speech was a summary of all the objections against the Jesuits—their haughty independence—their rigid ultramontane principles respecting papal power, stirring the people to revolt against those kings whom they chose to name tyrants—whilst they pretended to be never obnoxious to a prosecution for high treason, because they were subjects of no king whatever. Of course the orator did not forget Barriere, nor Varade, and he trembled as he spoke. He also brought home his argument by instancing the usurpation of Portugal by Philip II., whilst, of all the religious orders, the Jesuits were the only traitors who promoted the usurpation, and caused the death of 2,000 men, both monks and churchmen, for the slaughter of whom a bull of absolution was obtained. It was inconsistent to say that the whole Company should not be punished for the crimes of three or four members—because for the assassination of Cardinal Borromeus thirty years before, by one of the monks called the Humiliates, Pope Pius V. abolished the whole order, with the advice of the Cardinals, and in spite of the intercession of the King of Spain in their favour. It was evident that the Jesuit Order was more guilty than the Humiliates. The king should have compassion on the *University*. The multitude of colleges he was permitting in the provinces would be her ruin, by drawing off her supplies of students. Then the orator proffered a prayer for the safety of the king, the queen, and the dauphin, and concluded with “your very humble, very obedient, and very faithful subjects and servants.”¹ Nothing could

¹ There was something formidable in the stubborn machinations of the Jesuits, and enough to excuse these partisan declarations of their enemies. They established their sodalities, as during the League; and at their college of

be more to the purpose than these arguments at the time when Henry resolved to "evacuate his kingdom of the Jesuits:" but times were changed; and had the parliamentarians been as deep in the king's politics as were his secretaries and Roman ambassadors, it is probable that they would have held their tongues, made a virtue of necessity, and acquiesced in the return of the Jesuits, as gracefully as they had saluted the king himself—when they changed sides for a consideration. According to the Jesuits and others, the king delivered a splendid speech, in reply to this remonstrance. It was nothing less than a triumphant apology for the Jesuits—such as Father Cotton or Richeome, "the French Cicero," might have elaborately penned for the royal lips on that occasion. Step by step he met all the standard charges against the Jesuits: these charges were so constantly, so universally repeated, that the defence or apology was the easiest piece of sophistry in the world to be prepared for delivery: besides, if you compare the speeches, you will find that the king is made to answer objections not raised by

Dole, they roused an agitation by seditious declamations. The king was apprised of this and was requested to interfere, but without effect apparently. Cardinal D'Ossat was informed of the fact. This ambassador had urged the recall of the Jesuits at the pope's request, in his letter of March 5, 1598, to Villeroy. It was nothing less than what Bacon calls a hail-storm of arguments—all political, of course—in favour of the expedient patronage of the Jesuits: but in 1603, the year in question, he wrote as follows: "As to the declamations said to have taken place at the Jesuits' college at Dole, I am very much astonished, and know not what to think of the matter. At the very time when I wrote to you with more earnestness for the recall of the Jesuits into France, I protested to you, that I was never enamoured of them, and that what I did in the matter was with the thought that besides the good they might do to the Catholic religion, to science and literature, their recall would please the pope, and add to the good name and reputation of the king. Now, however, after having considered many things which I have read and heard of them, I declare to you that I will meddle no more in their affair; and I resign it once for all to what his Majesty and Council will judge for the best."—*Lettres du Card. D'Ossat*, v. 230, ed. Amst. 1714. Ed. in 4to, ii. 82, 1698.

Achille de Harlay. It would be tedious to give the speech entire—and no condensation of it can convey more than this, namely, that the speech was a complete justification of the Jesuit order—a perfect exoneration of the Jesuits in the late attempts against his life—a disbelief in their regicidal inculcations—in fact, a sweeping apology for the Company of Jesus. Can anything be more satisfactory for the Jesuits? Proudly, therefore, they quote the glorious speech in all their histories. Their opponents deny its authenticity. In my opinion, Henry did not compose the arguments : but I believe he delivered the substance, after a drilling or a study. What a testimonial to boast of! From any private individual leading the life of Henry IV., these Jesuits would have been ashamed to allege their justification : but from the lips of a king, all was glorious. The testimony of an angel from Heaven would not have gratified them more. It was conclusive—and yet—O venerable secret-telling Time—thou most unfeeling dissector, hast thou not proved, beyond contradiction, that the royal lips which uttered that apology of the Jesuits, prevaricated unscrupulously—deceiving all who heard him—himself into the bargain—for no self-deceit can equal the utterance of falsehood. Here is the proof. *Four days* after the king delivered that speech, namely, on the 28th of December, 1603, he wrote as follows to Maurice the Wise, Landgrave of Hesse :—“ I have also the greatest confidence in you, and desire to keep up a complete correspondence with you, on the events of these times, begging you to believe that I entertain the same intentions towards the ancient friends and allies of this crown, and touching the preservation of public peace in my kingdom being very much annoyed that cer-

tain persons are not so disposed towards myself, and that there are certain souls so perverse as to try to sow and infuse other opinions respecting the integrity and sincerity of my fidelity and word towards my subjects of the Protestant religion, under pretext that I have re-established the Jesuits in certain parts of my kingdom. My cousin, you have seen me: I am persuaded that you did not think me an Austrian—nor so bereft of sense and judgment: I beg you to believe that *in recalling the Jesuits, I am so far from wishing to unite myself to those who have made use of them, who now disturb Christendom, as publish* [here there are four or five words undeciphered], *that I propose to avail myself of them, and use their services for results quite the contrary, and even to traverse the designs of the Spaniards, whose avarice is insatiable.*"¹ In reply, the Landgrave doubted not that the king "would be able, by his judgment, so well to manage and lead the Jesuits, (who, as every one knew, studied to stir and disturb the common tranquillity), that they would not dare to undertake *again* anything similar in his kingdom:"² and a fortnight after

¹ "J'ai aussi toute confiance en vous et désire entretenir avec vous une entiere correspondance, &c. . . . vous priant croire que j'ay les mesmes intentions, tant envers les anciens amis et alliez de ceste couronne, que à l'entretènement et conservation de la paix publique de mon royaume, que je vous ay declarées et protestées lorsque vous estiez par deçà; estant bien marry que quelques uns n'en usent de mesme en mon endroict, et qu'il y ait des âmes si perverses de s'efforcer de semer et imprimer d'autres opinions, de l'intégrité et sincerité de ma foy et parole envers mes subjects de la religion prétendue reformée, sous prétexte de ce que j'ay restablî en aucuns lieux de mon royaume les Jesuites. Mon cousin, vous m'avez veu, je me persuade que vous ne m'avez trouvé Austrique ni sy hors de sens et jugement; je vous prie de croire que tant s'en fault que j'ay volenté, rapellant les Jesuites, de m'unir avec ceux qui se sont servis d'eux, qui à present troublent la Chretienté, comme publient que je pretends m'en prévaloir et aider à des effects tous contraires et mesmes à traverser les desseins des Espagnols, desquels la convoitise est insatiable."—*De Rommel, Correspond. inédite de Henri IV.* 148, Paris, 1840.

² "Et sçaura par son jugement si bien conduire et manier les Jesuites, lesquels

his last letter, the king says :—"I will tell you, in one word, that I am always just as you left me, and that it will not be in the power of the Jesuits, nor any other, to make me change my opinion nor my resolution."¹ These disclosures disgrace Henry IV., whilst they enlighten the judgment of history. But such was that diabolically astute spirit of the age, that the lowest villany was its highest virtue. So, all these fine encomiums on the Jesuits amount simply to the fact, that the king proposed to use them as instruments against their former masters—calling them the authors of the troubles in Christendom—and thus in one sentence falsifying the long windy speech which he thought it expedient to declaim to the parliamentarians, so as to give the Jesuits one motive more for virtuous reformation—because, to declare a man innocent in spite of his evident guilt, has sometimes the effect of strengthening him against future temptation.² On the

chacun sçait s'estre estudiez jusques à present de remuer et troubler le commun repos, qu'ils n'oseront rien plus entreprendre de semblable en votre royaume."—*Ibid. ut antea*, 156.

¹ "Par ainsy ja vous diray en un mot, que je suis tousjours tel que vous m'avez laissé, et qu'il ne sera en la puissance des Jesuistes, ny à autres, de me faire changer d'opinion ny de resolution."—*Ibid. ut antea*, 162.

² There seems to be little doubt that a Jesuit was made instrumental by the king of Spain in the conspiracy of the *Maréchal de Biron* against Henry IV. in 1602. "A Father Alexander, Spanish Jesuit, was sent by the king of Spain to the Duke de Biron, to inform him that the Council of Conscience in Spain had declared that they might accept the services of the Duke de Bouillon in so holy a cause, against a king of whom they said the worst things that an enemy can say ; it was vengeance on enemies by the means of enemies themselves."—*Extrait des Procès Crimin. de Biron et de Bouillon, Coudrette*, i. 316. To Beaumont Henry said : "I now wish to provide a good regulation, which, if well observed, the Jesuits will not be able, if they wish, to serve the king of Spain, nor even the pope to my detriment. To this regulation I will subject all who have remained within the reach of the parliaments of Toulouse and Bordeaux, as well as the others whom I shall re-establish in the places whence they have been expelled."—*Apud Coudrette*, i. 328. The letter was written just before the Edict of Recall, namely, Aug. 15, 1603.

other hand, the king stipulated that all the Jesuits in France must be Frenchmen born, without a single foreigner being admitted.¹ Still it was a desperate experiment for the king, and, with such motives, it must prove disastrous in the end. He plunged into the scheme from selfish motives, and thought he had cleverly taken every precaution, to prevent his French Jesuits from acting in France, the same tragi-comedies which the English Jesuits, with Parsons who kept *afar* from the *danger*, were exhibiting in England—for Beaumont, the French ambassador in England, wrote to Henry, only the year before, as follows :—"It is not necessary to be a bad subject in order to be a good Christian. Obstinacy, bad disposition, indiscreet zeal for the Catholic religion, have brought that sect in England to destruction. They not merely refused to acknowledge and obey the queen, but entered into conspiracies of all kinds against her person, and into alliances with enemies of the kingdom, in order to effect her downfall. Thus, instead of earning from her indulgence, protection, and support, they have provoked the queen in such fashion, that she was compelled, on behalf of her own security, to practise severity, and to take from them all liberty."²

Beating down scornfully all the opposition of his parliament, Henry received the Jesuits : the famous pyramid erected to commemorate Chatel's attempt, and their expulsion, was, subsequently, at their urgent request and under favour, razed to the ground : but it was curious that the first part taken down by the workmen was the *statue of Justice*.³

By the Edict of Restoration the Jesuits were to

¹ See the Edict in Du Mont, *Corps Diplom.* v. part ii. 31.

² Raumer, xvi. and xvii. cent. ii. ; Report of July 14, 1602, p. 183.

³ L'Etoile, iii. p. 273, note. Henry proposed to have it demolished during

deposit at the royal Court one of their body, as a hostage, and guarantee of their good conduct. Of course the king's indulgent confessor was the man selected, for whom Aquaviva composed instructions to teach him the duties of a royal confessor—instructions at which, in the present instance, Henry must have smiled, and said, Here are fine cobwebs for big flies, as we are, to break through. But in truth, Father Cotton possessed seductive qualities. L'Etoile says that he was a great theologian, and a still greater *courtier*. He cites one of the Jesuit's sermons, at *Nôtre Dame*, in the presence of the king and the whole royal family—when the oily courtier exclaimed that “it was better and more holy to pay taxes than to give alms to the poor : that one was a counsel, but the other was a commandment.” According to L'Etoile this maxim was often repeated by the Jesuit.¹ In Father Cotton the Jesuits found a powerful means for consolidating their establishment, and a safeguard against the assaults of their enemies : and in Henry IV. Father Cotton found an exhaustless treasury for the Jesuits. Refusing to be made an archbishop by his royal penitent, he obtained, in compensation, numerous establishments for his Company. At Moulins, Nevers, Rheims, Poitiers, Chartres, Sisteron, and other towns, colleges arose ; and a house for the professed was built at Arles. Henry IV. gave them the celebrated college of *La Flèche*, or rather, “the very house of his fathers,” to be converted into a college for Jesuits. He let them loose into Bearn, to wage war against Calvinism. He gratified their desire for work and expansion, and gave them his patronage by way of pass-port, to

the night, but Father Cotton objected, saying that *Henry IV. was not a king of darkness*. So the demolition took place by day. Ib.

¹ L'Etoile, iii. 101 and 174. Grégoire, p. 317.

Constantinople : the Sultan permitted the invasion in deference to the royal request, presented by Henry's ambassador at the Porte : a troop of missionaries advanced against the children of the prophet.¹ The Jesuits would spread their Company to the North of America, whilst it was figuring in the South, and Henry permitted them to join the French adventurers under Champlain, Dugas, and Potrin-court, who were starting to colonise Canada, hungry for lucrative settlements amongst the savages. The Jesuits loved settlements as well as any adventurers : but Potrin-court refused them a passage : they were compelled to wait for better auspices, which succeeded in time, after the murder of Henry by Ravaillac, when the evangelists went forth under the immediate patronage of the deceived, the neglected mistress of Henry, the famous *Marquise de Verneuil*.² What honour can the Jesuits claim from posterity for their favour with Henry IV. ? Was not their connection with a king who set all laws human and divine at defiance, when the insatiate lusts of his heart yearned for an object—was not that connection one of the most disgraceful compromises they ever made, for the sake of the

¹ Cretineau, iii. 72.

² Basely deceived by the king (Henry IV. had given her a written promise of marriage in case of an event which might follow her dishonour), this woman was discarded by the inconstant royal profligate. Then she listened to proposals from the Spanish embassy : for the Spaniards still pursued the king in spite of his supposed talisman, the Company of Jesuits. Henry condemned her father to perpetual imprisonment in the Bastille. He seemed to deserve his fate, having actually consented to the degradation of his daughter. Her confessor—for even mistresses had confessors in those days—was the natural son of Henry's divorced wife, Marguerite de Valois, sister to Henry III. He was a Capuchin monk, and was implicated in the conspiracy of the Marquise de Verneuil, his penitent. What a strange coincidence ! The bastard son of a queen of France conspires with the king's mistress to overturn his throne ! See *L'Etoile*, iii. 453, note. *Mem. Hist. par Amelot de la Houssaye*, p. 69—71. *Dreux-Duradier*, *Anecd. des Reines*, v. 583, and others ; also Grégoire, p. 325.

res Societatis—the welfare of the Company? It is impossible to give, in English, an adequate idea of that profligate Court to which Father Cotton, Jesuit, might be seen wending his way to shrive an impenitent king, ere he sacrilegiously conformed to the ceremonials of Rome, when he received his “quarterly” sacraments. Henry IV., the king so incessantly haunted by the Jesuits, had not his equal, or, rather, was not surpassed by any monarch of the times, in the perpetration of those sins which the Jesuit and other Catholic *theorists*, most awfully denounce in their books of piety. They winked at the king’s enormities, because he befriended them, gave them colleges and flattery, and gold. They saw, without seeing, how the “man, all blood and flesh, burst forth into lusty libertinage,” running from woman to woman, from the Duchess de Beaufort to Mademoiselle d’Antragues; from this woman to Jacqueline de Beuil; then to Charlotte des Essarts; then to the married Countess de Condé, perhaps the cause of his final doom, or one of the causes, at least. “Henry IV.,” says Capefigue, “gave the example of adultery, public and avowed. In the palaces of the queen, in the presence even of his new queen, he entertained his titled mistresses. And, by an outrage still more disastrous to public and private morals, he used to transfer these women, thus polluted, to complacent poor ‘gentlemen,’ who covered with their blushing fortunes the miserable debauches of an old king, inveterate in lust.” Capefigue relates a hideous fact in illustration—too infamous to be quoted. And yet the Jesuit Cotton, one day preaching to the king, apostrophised the hoary libertine, and told him that “he rejoiced to see in him so many marks of the eternal predestination of

God.”¹ All the world believed, and rightly too, that the father confessor treated the king with excessive indulgence. Not that a king or the lowest mortal is to be made a mark by outraging churchmen in such circumstances : but it is, and was then, of the utmost importance to religion, if it existed anywhere, that the apparent sanction of the worst profligacy imaginable should not be given by a minister of religion. The Jesuit gave him absolution, and the king gave the Company fine colleges and freedom of action :—so that the same letter which described his munificence to the Jesuits, gave, as the seasoning of that royal liberality, the details of “his freshest game” in the chace of debauchery.² Still the Jesuits represented the king as most “attentive to the affairs of religion,”—just like Alexander VI., in similar circumstances ; and throughout that reign they

¹ Quesnel, i. 41. See Capefigue, c. iv. and v.

² “The Jesuites have not only maintayned but increased dayly their credit and greatness. La Flesche in Anjou, the chief seat of the college and schooles, is grown from a small village to a well peopled town. The kyng is said to have given an hundred crownes towards their church and other buyldings (besides a graunt of his own heart and his queenes to be there interred hereafter) : he intendeth and promiset alse, as they saye, to intertayne there an hundred young gentlemen at his charge, which being enabled in their studies, shall be in time called thence to serve in offices of the crowne and of the highest dignities. These are projects and proceedyngs different from what he hath formerly professed, and protested against that Order : but he workes every day wonders, so these seem the less admirable. The Marques of Verneuil is heald and utterly cast off : the king never sees her, and his queene cannot be wrought (though by himself persuaded) to induce her—only the Countess of Moret preserves both their favours—his in fact, hers in appearance. Madame D’Essarts, otherwise La Hayne, is with chylde and without countenance. La Nory, Queen Margaret’s mayd his freshest game, is styll pursued by him, but like a wearye huntsman ; yet are his looks freshe, and his appetite to his meat as strong as ever. To tell your lordship of the playes, masks, and revels almost every night at the court (where his majesty sticks not sometimes to play the master of ceremonies in ordering the unruly multitudes) might be matter of vanity, but not answering your lordship’s grave expectation, &c. &c., John Finet.”—*MS. Bib. Cotton Calig. E. xi. 310*. A letter from John Finet to the Earl of Northampton.

scrupled not to receive from the women of the royal seraglio contributions for their foreign apostolates. They distinctly name *La Marquise de Verneuil* among their many patronesses, by way of showing, it would seem, how charity covers a multitude of sins.¹ And it was by the patronage of the king of France that the Jesuits were enabled to cope with their foes, the Dominicans, in the great dispute respecting Molinism, then raging in Catholic Christendom. "Spain" sided with the Dominicans, and "France" was for the Jesuits : Pope Clement pronounced no decision : both might teach their respective doctrines, because he durst not offend either the Dominican King of Spain or the Jesuit ruler of France.²

Death carried off Clement VIII., leaving Molinism still a bone of contention among the Catholics,—freeing Aquaviva, as I have stated, from the clutches of

¹ D'Orleans, *Vie du Père Cotton*, p. 155, *et seq.* It would be scarcely fair not to quote some Jesuit-anecdotes put forth in illustration of Henry IV. They quote one from L'Etoile respecting Father Gonthier, a preacher to the king. During a sermon, the king's mistress, *De Verneuil*, tried to make him laugh ; the Jesuit seeing this, and that the other women were noisy, exclaimed : "Sire, will you never be tired of coming with a seraglio into this holy place ?" Henry bore the rebuke, and refused to punish the Jesuit, though urged to do so by the insulted "ladies." However, when he thanked Gonthier for this correction, he begged him not to apply another in public. Cretineau quotes another anecdote to the effect that Henry was a desperate swearer, and his commonest oath was nothing less than a denial of God's existence—viz. *Jarni Dieu!* Father Cotton advised him to say *Jarni Cotton*, instead ; and the king repeated the comical Jesuit-oath as frequently as his other oath, *Ventre St. Gris*, and *Jarni Cotton* became a standard French blasphemy.

Cretineau gives a third, still more characteristic of Jesuit influence. It appears that the Huguenots attributed their disgrace with the king to the influence of the Jesuit—and used to say, as he would not hear them, that his "ears were filled with cotton." On one occasion, when Sully begged permission for his fellow-Protestants to hold their religious meetings in the suburbs of Paris, Henry said : "My ears are filled with cotton."—*Cretineau*, iii. 70. I know not what inference, the least favourable to them, can be drawn from these anecdotes by the Jesuits. They had better forget them, if they can.

² Ranke, p. 208 ; Cretineau, iii. p. 21.

Spain and his rebellious subjects, in the peninsula, whilst the Jesuits were enjoying the fruits of their multifarious labours in France. Let us thence look across the Channel, and behold the results of Jesuitism in England.

As a direct result of the Jesuit-expedition into England, the persecution of the Catholics by the English government is not excused—though few will affirm that the perils of the monarchy, as evinced by insurrections and the rumours of “stirs,” did not extenuate the guilt which history must record against Protestant England and her queen. If but half of the numerous “stirs” alleged against the Jesuits or the Spanish faction, be true, it is as difficult to exonerate their “religious” agents, as it is not to sympathise with the wretched, fooled, misguided Catholics, driven like blinded sheep to their destruction, or rewarded for their fidelity to their “renovated” creed by continual sufferings, owing to their real or supposed connection with the ever-plotting Jesuits and their Spanish faction.¹ Parsons was the

¹ In Sept., 1594 (when Parsons published his stirring book of Succession), the Jesuit Garnet, provincial in England, writes as follows to Parsons, according to Mr. Tierney: “The Friday night before Passion Sunday was such a hurley-burley in London, as never was seen in man’s memory; no, not when Wyatt was at the gates: a general search in all London, the justices and chief citizens going in person: all unknown persons taken, and put in churches, till the next day: no Catholics found, but one poor tailor’s house, at Golden Lane End, which was esteemed such a booty, as never was yet, since this queen’s days. The tailor and divers others there taken lie yet in prison; and some of them have been tortured. That mischance touched us near: They were our friends and chiefest instruments . . . That very night had been there Long John-with-the-Little-Beard (John Gerard), once your pupil, if I had not more importunately stayed him than ever before: but, soon after, he was apprehended, being betrayed, we know not how. He will be stout, I doubt not . . . Edward, John’s companion, was once taken in a garden in the country; but he showed himself nimble, leaped into the house, shut the door, and escaped away. Two months ago were taken eleven youths, going from Chester towards Spain—all in Bridewell, hardly used . . . Before that tumult of Golden Lane—they had laid a plot of these

mainspring of that ceaseless machination. Afar from the horrible scene of danger, he kept the flame of persecution roaring—everreckless of the torments he thus eventuated—by his remorseless pen—his obedient instrument of that destruction, which he concocted for his enemies, but which eventually recoiled on the very cause which he undertook to establish. Perhaps this Jesuit was the greatest enemy that the miserable English Catholics, priests as well as laity, ever had in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—for his spirit died not with the awful man—he bequeathed it to his Company in England. In 1591 his answer to Elizabeth's edict against the Catholics was given to the world—for *he* would arouse all Christendom to crush his country, in order to gratify that thing within him which some call zeal for the Catholic religion, but which was nothing else but the fierceness of his hard nature against opposition—as I shall prove in the sequel, convicting the man from his own lips, or his terrible pen. All that is scurrilous—all that is abusive, Parsons strung together in that answer to Queen Elizabeth—not forgetting to include Henry IV. of France—then aspiring to the throne—in his terrible denunciation and regicidal manifesto to the fanatics of orthodoxy. In various parts of the Continent the book was multiplied, and in 1593 a new edition was published at Rome, under the eyes of General Aquaviva. During that year, “the public mind,” says Dr. Lingard, “was agitated by rumours of plots against the life of the

great stir, and prepared the people's minds by a proclamation, wherein they commanded strait watches to be made, certain days in a week, everywhere for priests and Irishmen, whose late attempts to kill the queen had been discovered; and all Irishmen, not inhabitants in towns, and citizens, banished England; and all persons, not belonging to some nobleman or courtier, banished the court,” &c. &c.—*MS. in Tierney*, iii. 115, note.

queen. The death of Mary Stuart had not, as she anticipated, secured her from danger ; it made her appear to foreign nations as an usurper, who, to secure herself on the throne, had shed the blood of the true heir ; their prejudice against her was augmented by the continued execution of the Catholic missionaries, the narratives of their sufferings, and the prints representing the manner of their punishment ; and there were not wanting men of heated imaginations, who persuaded themselves that they should render a service to mankind by the removal of a woman, who appeared to them in the light of a sanguinary and unprincipled tyrant.”¹ And who was the man who had most recklessly in England, contributed to the production of these sentiments, as well as among the *foreign* nations abroad, against Elizabeth ? Robert Parsons, Jesuit—and his own words shall supply the proof. He says, in his edition of 1593 : “The queen has filled all neighbouring nations with wars, seditions, and furies, has afflicted France, destroyed Scotland, ruined Belgium, everywhere armed subjects against their princes, and has everywhere robbed what she could for her own benefit, and what she could not rob she has wasted with fire and sword, she has infested every land, every sea with robbers, she has spoiled the innocent of their goods, she has caused most flagrantly the shedding of blood in very many cases, and at the present time she disturbs and agitates almost every country of the North, by factions, hatred, and discord, divided against itself, and shattered by war. This is evident to every eye : it is the increasing burthen of every lip. And yet she, without shame, without a blush, says frequently, like Pilate, that she is innocent

¹ Hist. viii. 316.

of the blood of all : that she is free from blame : that she has done no evil. What shall I say to this ? Why, that I believe that her subjects are the greatest wretches and the greatest fools to believe this woman, who coins and forces into circulation, new dogmas in matters of religion, and relating to the salvation of souls,—since, in obvious matters, and such as are known to every one, they see that she pours forth lies so basely.”¹ Thus did *Parsons* denounce the queen as “a sanguinary and unprincipled tyrant ;” and Dr. Lingard should have said as much in his “impartial” History of England. And further he affirms :—“The universal school of theologians and ecclesiastical lawyers announce—and it is certain and an article of faith—that any Christian sovereign whatever, if he has manifestly fallen off from the Catholic religion, and has wished to lead away others from it, falls at once from all power and dignity, by the very force of rights, human and divine—and this, too, before the supreme pastor and judge has pronounced sentence against him ; and that all his subjects are free from all obligation of oath of allegiance which they may have sworn to him as their lawful prince ;

¹ “ Nam regina omnia vicina bellis, seditionibus et furoribus implevit, Galliam affixit, Scotiam destruxit, Belgium perdidit, subditos in principes ubique armavit, et undiquè ad suum commodum, quæ potuit rapuit, quæ non potuit, flammis ferroque delevit, terrâ marique itinera omnia latrociniis infestavit, innocentium bona diripuit, cruori effundendo causas notissimas locis plurimis dedit, universum ferè septentrionem sectis, odiis, ac discordiis in se divisum, bellisque conquassatum, turbat hodie atque exagitat, resque hæc omnium oculis tenetur, vocibusque cunctorum percrebescit ; et tamen illa sine fronte, sine rubore, hoc tantum scilicet ingeminat cum Pilato, se innocentem esse à sanguine omnium, se liberam à culpâ, se nihil mali fecisse. Quid hic dicendum ? Certe illud, opinor, miserrimos esse stultissimosque, qui huic femine in rebus religionis et ad animarum salutem pertinentibus, nova dogmata eudenti et obtrudenti credunt, cùm in rebus obviis et cuique notissimis, tam projectè mendacia fundentem cernant.”—*Responsio*, p. 178, n. 142.

and that they may, and must, if they have the power, drive such a man from the sovereignty of Christian men, as an apostate, heretic, a deserter of Christ the Lord, and an enemy to the state, lest he corrupt others, or turn them from the faith by his example or command.”¹ Thus did *Parsons* “persuade men of heated imaginations that they should render a service to mankind by the removal of the woman :” and Dr. Lingard should have said as much in his “impartial” History of England. Add to all this the violent declamation, in which he compares Elizabeth to the pagan persecutors, to *Nero*, to *Antiochus*—heaping upon the queen the foulest imputations—and insinuating that she was a bastard—leaving to the “men of heated imaginations” to draw the necessary conclusion that she had no right to the crown of England.² Unquestionably, Dr. Lingard had read these declarations of Parsons, and yet, in a note to the passage I have quoted, he quotes without comment one of those unblushing assertions which Parsons never scrupled to put forth on any occasion. He says : “Parsons himself informs us that he himself had dissuaded some individuals, and particularly one, who ‘for delivering of Catholique people from persecution, had resolved to lose his own life, or to take away that of her

¹ “Hinc etiam infert universa Theologorum, ac jurisconsultorum Ecclesiasticorum schola (et est certum et de fide) quemcunque principem Christianum, si à religione Catholicâ manifestò deflexerit, et alios avocare voluerit, excidere statim omni potestate ac dignitate, ex ipsâ vi juris tum humani, tum divini, hocque ante omnem sententiam supremi Pastoris ac judicis contrâ ipsum prolatam, et subditos quoscunque liberos esse ab omni juramenti obligatione, quod ei de obedientiâ tamquam principi legitimo præstitissent, posseque et debere (si vires habeant), istiusmodi hominem, tanquam Apostatam, hæreticum, ac Christi Domini desertorem et reipublicæ inimicum hostemque ex hominum Christianorum dominatu ejicere, ne alios inficiat, vel suo exemplo aut imperio à fide avertat.”—*Ibid. ut antea*, n. 157, p. 196.

² *Ibid. ut antea*, pp. 65, 69, 101, 102, 260, 257, 397, 371.

majestie.’” He had already,” continues Dr. Lingard, “proceeded more than one hundred miles on his journey, when Persons met him, and, after much reasoning, prevailed on him to lay aside the project, *chiefly* on the ground that ‘the English Catholics themselves desired not to be delivered from their miseries by any such attempt’”!¹ True, indeed, of the vast majority of Catholics,—but, if Parsons really dissuaded the attempt, he had his political motive at the time for his forbearance; and no man can reasonably think otherwise after reading what the furious denouncer of Elizabeth poured forth as fact, and affirmed as an article of faith—“this true, determined, and undoubted opinion of very learned men, is perfectly conformed and agreeable to the apostolic doctrine.”² Now, whilst the queen and her councils, and the Protestants generally, were aware that such a man as Parsons existed, and that this book of his, and innumerable letters from the same pen, were circulating far and wide, surely there was ample cause for apprehension; and if the party concerned deemed violent, cruel persecution the only means of forfending its own destruction, the other party, or the Catholics had to thank that execrable Spanish faction of the Jesuits for their piteous calamities.³ The Jesuits were now

¹ Lingard, viii. 317, note; Parsons, *Ward-Word*, 70.

² Ibid. *ut antea*, n. 158. I have quoted these passages before, in connection with others, from other regicidal Jesuits of the day.

³ “I have censured,” says Mr. Tierney, the candid Catholic historian, “the ungrateful cruelty of the government towards the loyal and unoffending Catholics at home: it is impossible to avoid condemning the conduct of those fugitives abroad, who, by their treasonable writings, and not less treasonable practices, were thus seeking to overturn the government, and alter the succession to the throne. Of the *encouragement extended, as the reader has seen in the Appendix, to the trade of the assassin*, I say nothing; the beings who could resort to such means of accomplishing their purposes, belong not to society. But there were other and better spirits among them, men of bloodless, though mistaken, zeal,

the lords of the English mission—ruling or influencing most effectually all the foreign seminaries that supplied the creatures of faction, under the name of missionaries of the faith. Incessantly at variance among themselves, they injured their cause, and disgraced their religion : but the Jesuits availed themselves of these dissensions, which they mainly caused, to organise their faction in the service of Spain. No opponents could cope with the Jesuits : their superior address, or superior influence, triumphed over every obstacle, and fortified them in their bad eminence.¹ During the life of the Scottish Queen, the conspiracies formed among the Catholic exiles, having for their primary object the invasion of the realm, were all directed to the ulterior purpose of placing that princess on the throne of England. “But, after her death,” says Mr. Tierney, “the jealousies which had already existed for some time, manifested themselves in open division. With different interests, different views presented themselves, and two parties, each with separate objects, were formed. The first, with Morgan and Paget at its head, looked to the King of Scots as the representative of his mother, and the nearest heir to the English crown. To him, its members turned as to their future and rightful sovereign ; from him, and from his gratitude, they looked for toleration, if not for

who would have gloried in wresting the crown from the enemy of their religion, but would have shrunk from the idea of becoming her murderers. To the minds of such men the importance of the object for which they struggled, the restoration of their religion, may have offered a sufficient justification for the violence of their proceedings. Yet they should have remembered the example of the apostles and the early Christians : they should have recollected that their ministry was the ministry of peace—their duty, that of preaching, sacrifice, and prayer : in a word, they should have called to mind the suffering state of their persecuted brethren at home ; and, *placed in security themselves*, should have hesitated to exasperate the government against those who were still within the reach of its resentment.”—*Dodd*, iii. 30, n. 5.

¹ See *Ling*, viii. 331.

encouragement ; and, in the meantime, they sought to propitiate the existing government, by protestations of allegiance, by offers of personal service, and by communications, betraying the plans and proceedings of their opponents.¹ These opponents were denominated the Spanish Party. They acted under the direction of Allen and Parsons ; and their principal members were, the Fathers Holt and Cresswell, Sir Francis Englefield, Sir William Stanley, Fitzherbert, and Owen. Their object was, the restoration of the Catholic religion, and, as a means of effecting this, the establishment of a Catholic sovereign on the throne. At first, their views centered in the daughter of the Spanish king ; and to recommend her to the English nation, Parsons, in 1594, published his "*Conference about the neat succession*," maintaining the right of the people to regulate the descent of the crown, asserting that the profession of a false religion was sufficient to justify the exclusion of the heir apparent, and then, having enumerated the several persons connected by their ancestry with the royal family, concluding, at least by implication, that the infanta, as a Catholic, and the lineal descendant of John of Ghent, the son of Edward III., was the individual to whom the country ought to look, as the successor of Elizabeth."² "This tract," says Dr. Lingard,

¹ Neville to Cecil, apud Winwood, i. p. 51.

² Dodd, iii. 29, n. 4. Parsons signed this book with the name of *Doleman*. There was a priest in England at the time by that name, who happened to be under the Jesuit's displeasure. It was generally thought that Parsons wished to punish him by fixing the authorship, or its suspicion, and consequent annoyance, on the reverend clergyman. Nothing is certainly more probable—at all events, the actual existence of such a name amongst the Catholic clergy ought to have induced him to avoid the name in such a case. He affected to derive it etymologically from the Latin, to mean "a man of sorrow!"—the better derivation would have been "a man of craft," from *dolus*. Parsons and the Jesuits staunchly denied, as usual, that Parsons was the author, and Dr. Lingard seems

“excited an extraordinary sensation, both in England and on the Continent. It alarmed and irritated the queen and her ministers. It flattered the pride of Philip, who, at the persuasion of Parsons, had consented to renounce his own pretensions, with the vain hope of seeing his daughter seated on the English throne. For eight years Philip, though he might threaten, had literally done nothing against England. He appeared to sleep over the war, till the blow received at Cadiz, inflicted by the English fleet, in 1596, awakened him from his apathy. Now he publicly vowed revenge ; the fleet from the Indies had replenished his treasury ; his people offered him an abundant supply of money ; and he ordered the adelantado of Castile to prepare a second armada for the invasion of England. An emissary hastened to England to sound the disposition of the Earl of Essex ; and the exiles, in their secret councils, formed different plans to promote the success of the projected invasion, and to facilitate the accession of their imaginary queen.”¹ At the same time,

to side with them ; but nothing can be more conclusive than Mr. Tierney’s arguments to prove that Parsons was the author of that Spanish instrument. Mr. Tierney’s remarks bear heavily on the utter faithlessness of the Jesuit, and the highly interesting argumentation is well worth perusal. After an appeal to undeniable documents, Mr. Tierney triumphantly concludes thus : “The authorship of the work is distinctly and unequivocally acknowledged ; and the question of ‘Who wrote the book of Succession ?’ may now, I think, be considered as satisfactorily decided.”—*Ib. ut antea*, p. 31—35, n. 6.

¹ Hist. viii. 333, and 330. Amongst Bishop Kennett’s coll. of MSS. in the Bib. Lansd. vol. xlix. f. 165, I found “A paper of Intelligence out of Spain, to a minister of the English Court in 1597, advising that Father Parsons had received above 300 letters out of England in applause and approbation of his booke of Succession. That they design to create an English cardinal, which, if their plot succeed, will be Father Parsons, who designs to publish two books, the one entitled the Declaration of the King of Spain’s intentions ; the second, A Reformation of Imperfections, as well of matters of Estate as of Religion, in England.”

Sir Francis Englefield wrote a letter to the King of Spain in favour of the project as being, of all, “undoubtedly the most feasible.” He urges the necessity for “removing, or putting under restraint, a few of the leading agitators belonging to the opposite faction—Englishmen residing in Flanders and Rome, and employing themselves in *corrupting* others (!), and that their places be supplied by others, whose zeal in your Majesty’s cause is deserving of this encouragement. It is on this, in fact, that the success of any negotiation with the English must depend (!). With regard to the journey of Father Parsons to Rome, although, on the one hand, I see the good likely to result from it, yet, on the other, knowing the hatred and aversion with which he is regarded by the Scottish and French factions, (who, in consequence of his reply to the queen’s edict, of the book written on the succession, and discovering the hitherto unknown pretensions of Portugal and Castile to the English crown, and of other things which the said father has written and done, and daily continues to do, on that side of the question, consider him as the leader of the party attached to your Majesty’s interests) knowing this, I say, it always has appeared, as it still appears, to me, that his journey will involve him in the greatest danger, unless he goes strongly supported by your Majesty, with an express order to the ambassador at Rome to prevent his detention there, through any contrivance of the opposite party, to provide for his safety during his residence in Italy, and to have assistance at hand in case of any emergency ;—and, even with all these precautions, I fear for the consequences. The project, which Father Parsons told me he had discussed with your Majesty’s ministers, a few months

since, at Toledo, of a special conference on the affairs of England, to be held in Flanders, under the presidency of the cardinal-archduke, and to be joined by some confidential persons of the English nation, is of so much importance, that until it is effected, and until the nation shall possess some head securely attached to your Majesty's interests,¹ I look for no favourable issue to the affairs of England, deranged as they constantly will be by the arts of the factious."² The Duke of Feria, at the beginning of the following year, wrote to Philip a stringent letter against the proceedings of the opposite faction. "I have received positive information that his Holiness told Dr. Barrett, the president of Douay College, that the same parties had written to solicit the removal from Flanders of Father Holt, a member of the Society of Jesus, and *the most efficient of your Majesty's servants in that country*."³ Nay, in this most accommodating Company—open to all the world, to every party, at one and the same time, the opposite faction found supporters, abroad, in the General Aquaviva and his party, and at home, in the Jesuit Creighton, a Scotchman, with whom the reader is acquainted. "It is a matter of no less importance," continues the Duke of Feria to the king, "that your Majesty should command the general of the Society of Jesus to avail himself of some favourable opportunity for removing Father Creighton, a member of that Society, who is not only an avowed advocate of the King of Scots, but who has also frequently spoken to me, with the most passionate feeling, on the subject of that monarch's

¹ Mr. Tierney very shrewdly asks: "Does he not here allude to the project of making *Parsons a cardinal*?" The MS. I have quoted at p. 71, *note*, makes the fact almost evident, if not completely so, for both documents were written in 1597.

² MS. apud Tierney, iii. Append. xiii.

³ MS. *ibid*.

affairs. As a man, in fact, of vehement temperament, religious, however, in his principles, and esteemed by many for his exemplary demeanour, his influence is capable of producing the most injurious consequences in Flanders ; and his place, therefore, would be advantageously supplied by Father Gordon, a Scotchman, and uncle to the Earl of Huntley—a quiet and dispassionate person, *divested of his prepossessions in favour of his own sovereign*, and agreeing with those among the English who are proceeding in the right road.” The duke concludes with denouncing another member of the opposite faction, who, he says, “to increase his importance by accomplishing his purposes, will never hesitate to effect any mischief.”¹ About three months after, a letter of Parsons to Holt was intercepted by the government, and its contents were blazed to the world, as a proof triumphant that he was the accredited agent of Spain, employed expressly to support the pretensions of the Infanta, as evidenced to *us* by the preceding memorial of Englefield. By his own words in this intercepted letter, it appears that his plan was, in the first instance, to propose the matter generally to the pope, to allow him time to reflect on it for awhile, and then, in case of doubt or difference, to urge his own opinion in favour of the Infanta, to be married to the Cardinal Farnese—this wild, worse than Quixotic scheme, he thought “the most useful, probable, and feasible !”²

¹ MS. *ibid.* *ut antea*.

² MS. *ib.*, in Parsons’s own handwriting. “Benche, a parer mio, nissun accordo sarebbe più utile, probabile, ò fattibile, *che nella persona della signora infanta, maritata al principe cardinale.*” These words are scored by Parsons himself, says Mr. Tierney. But in his “Manifestation,” subsequently published, when he found himself hard pressed by the opposite faction, he only gave the substance of the letter “with tolerable fidelity,” as Mr. Tierney observes, down to the general proposition to the pope ; the rest, which I have

Working for the king assiduously, the Jesuit denounced the opposite faction in a letter to Don Juan d'Idiaquez, three months after. "The faction of Charles Paget and Thomas Morgan" he stated to be "the source of much past and present injury to the cause of his Majesty in England." Then he proceeds to trace the beginning of their hostility to the King of Spain:—the disclosures are most curious and important, as follows: "The origin of their estrangement may be traced to the year 1582, when, at a meeting in Paris, attended by the Nuncio, the Spanish ambassador, John Baptist de Taxis, the Duke of Guise, the Archbishop of Glasgow, as ambassador from the Queen of Scots, and others,¹ it was determined that the conversion of England and Scotland should rest solely on the support of the King of Spain; and, in pursuance of this resolution, the Fathers Parsons and Creighton were ordered to proceed, the former to Lisbon, the latter to Rome, in order to obtain some assistance for Scotland. From this meeting Paget and Morgan, who were residing in France as the agents of the Scottish queen, were excluded. Irritated at this affront, they applied to two of the queen's secretaries, with whom they corresponded, Nau, a Frenchman, and Curle, a native of Scotland, who both resided with her in England, who possessed her cipher, and held considerable sway in her councils;

given above, "he compresses into the small compass of an *&c.*"—and then, speaking of himself in the third person, gravely adds,—"Thus he writeth, as you see, in great confidence and secrecy, to his dearest friend," f. 49, a. Bishop Dicconson, remarking on the words, "as you see," shrewdly asks, "But who sees whether or not he has given an entire copy thereof?" Marginal annotation, written by the bishop, in the copy of the Manifestation, belonging to Ushaw College.—*Tierncy*, iii. *Append.* xiii.

¹ There were three Jesuits in the consultation, Creighton, Matthieu, and Parsons himself, as I have stated before.

and they so far influenced the views of these men, that the four, in conjunction, speedily contrived to alienate the mind of the unhappy queen, and destroy the confidence in the scheme thus set on foot for her employment of Spain. In proof of this, we have the still living testimony of Father Henry Samerie, a French Jesuit, who now resides in Flanders, and who, at the period in question, living with the Queen in England, in the character of her physician, was privy to all that passed. The fact was also attested by the Duke of Guise, in his lifetime, who said, with much concern, to several persons, and particularly to his Confessor, Father Claude Matthieu Loranès, of the Society of Jesus, to Father Parsons, and to some others, that, through the instrumentality of Paget and Morgan, who had represented him as the sworn creature of Spain and of the Jesuits, he himself, in a certain transaction, had been wholly deprived of the queen's confidence." He then asserts the fact that "these men endeavoured to persuade the Duke of Guise to liberate the queen and place her on the throne of England and Scotland, by means of French troops and French friends, to the exclusion of the Spaniards." "Another instance of their treasonable conduct was, that, at the very time they were treating with the Duke of Guise, Allen, and Parsons, to procure a supply of troops from Spain, of the speedy arrival of which there was every probability, they secretly sent to England a certain spy, named *William Parry*, who had been many years employed by the Queen of England in Italy and elsewhere. This man, as we learn from his published confessions, immediately disclosed to the queen whatever had passed, and moreover told her that he was commissioned, when

the proper time should arrive, to murder her, to place the Scottish Queen on the throne, and thus to prevent the Spanish invasion, which was promoted by the Jesuits. The queen, though, at the time, she expressed her gratitude, and bestowed rewards on him, subsequently ordered him to be executed. Such was the end of Doctor Parry." This affair is generally laid to the charge of the Jesuits ; but Parry stated that a Jesuit dissuaded him from the attempt ; and it is now suggested by this disclosure of Parsons, that the only motive for dissuading him was simply on account of the forthcoming "*Spanish invasion, which was promoted by the Jesuits,*" who were now in opposition to the Queen of Scots, for the benefit of the King of Spain! What a strange and diabolical affair! The Scottish faction actually contrive the murder of Elizabeth so as to defeat the contrivance of the Spanish faction—and when the murderer proposes the scheme—doubtless by way of a trap to the Spanish faction—they dissuade it because the queen's murder would defeat *their* "idea," to promote the greater glory of God!¹ Paget and Morgan, says Parsons, published a declaration "that the Queen of Scots was herself equally opposed to the invasion and its abettors ; and that she would avail herself of any species of relief, in preference to the intervention of Spanish troops, as proposed by the Jesuits." Then the Jesuit discloses a critical fact in the history of the unfortunate

¹ See Lingard, viii. p. 176, for an account of Parry, his conviction, and its dreadful consequences to the poor Catholics, in consequence of the supposed approval of his design by the pope. In vain they petitioned and protested their loyalty and detestation of the atrocious machinations against the queen and country. The person who volunteered to present the petition in behalf of the Catholics was imprisoned for his "presumption ;" and the Protestant party, made desperate by fear, pursued their cruel and crushing measures.

Queen of Scots—a fact always suspected, but never before attested by so competent a witness as the well-informed, universal spy, Father Parsons, of the Company of Jesus. Mary then opposed the Spanish faction. “To this effect, in reality,” says Parsons, “the queen herself wrote to the Duke of Guise, in 1585, directing him to keep a watchful eye on the proceedings of the Jesuits, as connected with any plan of Spanish interposition ; and taking an opportunity, at the same time, to *reprehend the duke and the Archbishop of Glasgow for having omitted to supply a certain sum of money, on the petition of Morgan and Paget, to a certain young gentleman in England, who, in consideration of the reward, had promised them, so they persuaded her majesty, to murder the Queen of England. The fact was, that the duke and the archbishop understood that the party in question (his name is here omitted, because he is still living)*¹ *was a worthless fellow, and would do nothing, as it eventually turned out ; and, on this account, refused to provide the money. Yet for this it was that Paget and Morgan induced the queen to reprehend them.*” “Can this passage,” indignantly asks the Catholic historian, the Rev. Mr. Tierney, “can this passage admit of any other interpretation than that the writer himself, and, if we may believe his statement, all the parties here mentioned approved of the design to murder Elizabeth—that Mary was actively engaged in the scheme—and that the duke and the archbishop refused to supply the reward, *only* because they were not assured that the deed would be performed ?”² This fact must surely diminish the romance of Mary’s career

¹ Here, in the margin of the MS., the initials J. G. are written, says Mr. Tierney.

² MS. apud Tierney, iii. Append. xiii.

and its termination : it must also extenuate the blame attached to Elizabeth and the Protestant party : it must likewise prove, by the writer's way of stating it, that I was justified in doubting the other statement of Parsons before given, to the effect that he stopped an intended murder of the queen ; or if he did so, his motive was political :—the deed would be either unseasonable, or was not likely to be effectually achieved by the “worthless fellow.” Nevertheless, after urging that the king should remove from Flanders the leaders of the opposite faction, or deprive them of their pensions as exiles for the faith, this regicidal Jesuit is brazen-hearted enough to conclude his memorial with a prayer to the Almighty : “May our Lord ordain what is most expedient”—but perhaps by “our Lord” he meant the King of Spain, who was sure to say Amen. Philip appears to have consulted the leading exiles as to the practicability of his second invasion. Various answers were returned to his inquiries. Some approved of the invasion : others suggested the possibility of the secret negotiation with Cecil : but all agreed in representing any attempt to annex England to the Spanish crown as utterly hopeless. Mr. Tierney makes this statement from documents in his possession, one of which he has published ; and “it is,” as he remarks, “evidently the production of one of the most clear-sighted of the party ; and is valuable for the statement, which it contains, of the views and feelings of the Catholic body in England.” This bold truth-teller told the Spanish king that the King of Scotland had by far the best chance of succeeding. “In England, he hath for him the greatest part of the nobility and people, as they may be named, if without their prejudice it might be done. He hath in like manner, in

England, the greatest part of the Catholics ; for his Catholic majesty hath for him in England no heretic ; and for the Catholics, he hath only those who *depend upon the direction of the Jesuits*, who are few—nor all those, because the Jesuits are very few, and dare not labour openly, as the secular priests do, to gain a great number. And of four hundred secular priests which are in the kingdom, there are not thirty which follow the fathers' direction, to draw the Catholics to embrace the designment of the Catholic king : and so the greater part are for the King of Scotland his succession into that kingdom ; as the Catholics, in their religion, are guided by their function. And to be short, speaking as it were generally, those that shall seek the succour of Spain, to drive out heresy, would not willingly submit themselves under the dominion of the Spaniards, but rather to the King of Scotland, if he were Catholic, as they hope he will be, to get the kingdom *It is holden for certain that the people of England, in whom consisteth the force of the kingdom, (as in Scotland it doth in the nobility)* will not agree to give themselves to any whose right is doubtful and they knowing generally the manifest right of the King of Scotland, being descended of the eldest sister of Henry VIII. ; probably they will all follow him : and this is already the common voice of the people.”¹ In addition to this most important objection to the Spanish scheme, it was evident that James would be strenuously supported on the Continent—among the rest by Henry IV. of France, in hatred of the Spaniard. Yet did Parsons and his faction “stir” the fatuous bigot of Spain to the undertaking, which was as treasonable to the people who, by

¹ MS. apud Tierney, iii. Append. xiii.

a vast majority, refused to be his subjects, as it was to their queen and the established monarchy. Parsons knew this well enough : to that heart of iron it was an additional motive to press the invasion—as it were in punishment of the “greatest wretches and the greatest fools” who relied on the “woman,” as he termed the people of England and their queen. You will soon read ample proof that such a motive is quite in accordance with that Jesuit’s character. The English Catholics, then, finally disappointed the original scheme of the Jesuits—disappointed it in spite of every machination on the part of the faction, and in spite of all their sufferings by the persecutions which that faction eventuated so recklessly—in one word, Jesuitism in England was a complete failure, as far as the scheme in hand was concerned—and that was a consolation : but bitter was its result to the Catholics and ever to be lamented. This calamity is, however, compensated by the fact, that by urging the Spanish king to these Quixotic experiments, the Jesuits accelerated the downfall of that most hideous Moloch of earth’s monarchies, and unconsciously expedited the providential retribution so necessarily foredoomed against that universal tyrant amongst the nations of the earth. Need I state the result of this second invincible Armada ? Again did the elements fight for Elizabeth and her people. God would not have the Spaniard in this kingdom. Call it a casualty if you like : but, for my part, I can see nothing in these most extraordinary manifestations, but an immediate interposition of that Arm which will sometimes suddenly arrest the meditated iniquity of kings and factions. We can scarcely compute the disastrous consequences to this nation that would have ensued to the

present day, from the usurpation of the English crown by the Spaniard. Heaven foresaw them: heaven defended them. Look to the Americas—a mere “casualty”—a mere *turn of the helm*—carried Columbus to the south rather than to the north of the Great Continent—and behold the result—compare Spanish America with British America—and bless God for the “casualty” which thus saved you from moral, physical, and intellectual degradation. Against the Spaniards and their Rome and Jesuits, the elements of heaven were the defenders of your country—

“ Together with
The natural bravery of your isle, which stands
As Neptune’s park, ribbed and paled in
With rocks unscaleable, and roaring waters—
With sands that will not bear your enemies’ boats,
But suck them up to the top-mast.”¹

It was in the following year, 1598, that occurred the attempt or design of Squires and the Jesuit Walpole, to

¹ Catholics claim Shakspeare for a member of the Roman Church. It is a tribute to the man’s genius. Had he remained a poacher, they would have left him exclusively to the Protestants. That he was one of Elizabeth’s men is certain—and there is ample evidence to prove that she never objected to a man on account of the form of his religion. Shakspeare’s was not the mind to belong to any set of religionists—even to please his royal mistress, had she insisted. On the other hand, it speaks immensely for the courtly and Protestant audience of Shakspeare’s plays, that he did not find it necessary to lash Romanism in his *plays*, at a time when partyism ran so high. If the thing proves his good sense, it also proves the moderation, if not total indifference to the mere religionism of her subjects, in the mind of Elizabeth. And there is a curious inconsistency in the polemics on this subject: some represent the queen as totally indifferent in matters of religion, others make her greatly inclined to many practices and doctrines of Rome—and yet they all “show her up” as a persecutor of the Catholics, &c., solely on account of their religion. Unquestionably, Romanism, was, at least, in those days, closely allied to treason in every Protestant kingdom—as I have plainly proved—and, therefore, if Elizabeth’s persecution was cruel, unchristian, and therefore useless—the Catholic “martyrs” could only be martyrs to two pardonable errors, that of the Elizabethan council, and their *own*.

poison Elizabeth, as I have related in connection with Mariana's suggestions, *at the very time*, as to the various methods of cutting off a "tyrant" or heretic-ruler. If we appeal to the opinion of *Parsons* on regicide, as just insinuated by him, the attempt amounts at least to a probability. It is only by taking a wide and comprehensive view of Jesuitism, and by grouping various facts together, that we can snatch the truth from the clutching grasp of the all-denying Jesuits.

Ireland was still, as it is at present, the vulnerable heel of England. Since the year 1593, the Earl of Tyrone had proclaimed himself the O'Neil, and was considered by his countrymen as the Irish sovereign of Ulster. The queen's bountiful favours had exalted him to wealth and dignity. The Spaniard and the pope enabled him to stand forth a rebel to his royal mistress. In 1599, the O'Neil received from Spain a recruit of money and ammunition for his insurgents, with assurances that a number of troops, in aid of their successful exertions, would immediately follow. The pope sent him a consecrated plume, and a Bull, by which he granted to him and his adherents the same indulgences as to those who fought against the Turks, for the recovery of the Holy Land. Civil rights were to be achieved—the Catholic religion was to be restored—with the help of these Spanish aids, papal blessings, and two thousand five hundred horse. Lord Mountjoy dissipated all these hopes, with terrible inflictions. The insurgents saw their detachments cut off, their provisions wasted, the English everywhere triumphant: their cultivated fields and everything that afforded them the means of subsistence destroyed by the enemy. The heart sickens at the thought of these horrid devastations—rendered

more deplorable by their origin—vain infatuation, foreign deception, and “religious” instigation. A famine completed the miseries of the Irish. Elizabeth, in order to neutralise the large pecuniary aids sent to the rebels from abroad, ordered base money to be coined, and permitted no other to be exported to Ireland. The English, as well as the Irish, suffered from this iniquitous and short-sighted policy :—a rebellion amongst her own troops had nearly chanced to teach the queen the simple axiom, that honesty is the best policy. The O’Neil was ruined. Craft and dexterity utterly defeated infatuation and rebellion. A Spanish fleet came to the aid of the rebels : but the rashness of the Spanish general, Don Juan d’Aguilar, was the utter ruin of the cause, which might otherwise, thus enforced, have proved something like a liberation for Ireland. But thus it was not destined to be. The effort had no honest beginning : it could have no satisfactory ending :—it failed by itself. The Spaniard would rush to battle, when he ought to have remained entrenched : the Irish rushed, as usual : they were utterly defeated, with 1200 slain and 800 wounded. The Spaniard sailed off to his master to concoct another scheme, if possible, against the invulnerable Queen of England. Meanwhile, of course, the misguided Irish remnants suffered for their betrayers : they were hunted down and butchered like wild beasts, and the province of Munster was one continued scene of havoc and devastation. Inflamed by resentment, and driven to despair, the rebels in return slaughtered without mercy all the English they could seize, in their pitiable madness.¹

¹ Camden ; Rapin ; Lingard ; Crawford, i. Here is a contrast. “ Last night, (March 26, 1847) another kindly effort was made to aid the life-struggle

Neither repeated failure, nor the severities of the government, could “check *the unwise and criminal activity* of those who favoured the Spanish pretension.”¹ Allen was dead : but Parsons, who had always taken the lead, bent all his energies to the prosecution of his Spanish idea—*now* in the expectation of the *natural* termination of that royal life against which so many bad hearts prayed desperately to heaven, appealed fiercely to earth—and could find none but “worthless fellows” to barter for its bloody destruction. If the English character naturally partakes somewhat of the bull-dog, how shall we symbolise it when it has been licked into shape by the mother-bear of Loyola ? God’s elements had taught Parsons a lesson : counter-intrigue he knew was constantly springing a mine beneath him : the crushing power, and the triumphant vigilance or craft, of the

in Ireland, and produced a thousand dollars. Adelaide Kemble (Sartoris) in unison with a number of amateurs, German, Russian, and Italian, got up an extemporaneous concert ; and the Spanish Envoy at this court (Rome) flung open the long deserted halls of the once gorgeous palace of his national embassy, for their reception . . . Nearly three hundred years ago, in these identical saloons, Olivarez, and the General of the Jesuits, Aquaviva, organised the rebellion of Hugh O’Neil, in Ulster ; and here the ‘blessing’ of the Spanish Armada was concocted. The same roof looked down last night on somewhat more creditable proceedings.”—*Facts and Figures from Italy*, p. 241.

Strange vicissitude of mortal things, and all the glorious majesties that bubble and burst, ere a single generation is converted into gas !

“ In might though wondrous, and in acts of war,
Nor of renown less eager, yet by doom
Cancell’d from heaven and sacred memory,
Nameless in dark oblivion let them dwell.
For strength from truth divided, and from just,—
Illaudable, nought merits but dispraise
And ignominy ; yet to glory aspires
Vain-glorious, and through infamy seeks fame ;
Therefore eternal silence be their doom.”

¹ Butler, Mem. ii. 47.

Elizabethan government foiled him incessantly :—yet did he unflinchingly persevere—perhaps the very success of the antagonist-craft arrayed against him, redoubled his resolution—stimulated his invention to the concoction of some scheme at last, which might eventuate for him a glorious, a self-complacent sabbath. His ministers in England were not less active, if they were more courageous, than their leader. In 1601, another invasion was advocated by the Spanish faction. Garnet, the English provincial of the Jesuits, gave the conspirators a letter of introduction to the Jesuit Cresswell, then residing in Spain, in order “to give more credit to the undertaking.” Subsequently, Garnet endeavoured to explain away the part he took in the enterprise : but it does not appear, when, on the return of one of the envoys, Thomas Winter, he was told that the scheme was adopted by Philip III., that he resorted to any means of disconcerting the project : nor was it to be expected that he should do otherwise than approve of what Parsons, the pope, and the entire faction so earnestly desired. Spain was to pay over a sum of one hundred thousand crowns, to be employed in securing a sufficient party among the natives : an army was to land in the spring of 1603 ; if numerous, on the coast of Essex and Kent ;—if deficient in numbers,—at Milford Haven ; while the Catholics, in the meantime, were to be ready to join the invading force, and to provide horses for the service of the Spanish cavalry. The Jesuit Tesmond, *alias* Greenwell, was one of the negotiators, together with Catesby, of gun-powder-plot notoriety. Garnet treasured the scheme carefully in his breast ; and the time for its execution was rapidly approaching, when it was suddenly frustrated by the death

of Elizabeth, and the unanimous acknowledgment of her successor.¹ The immediate result, however, was a royal "Proclamation against Jesuits and others," on the 5th of November, 1602. The queen spoke sensibly enough on the subject, though she assumed what no experience ever attested, namely, that opposition to priestly and Jesuit-will, however backed with vigorous measures, ever succeeded in bringing them to their senses. "We truly confess," she said, "that our hope was, that those Romish priests, who were sent into this realm by foreign authority, to seduce our people from their affection to religion, and so, by consequence, from the constancy of their obedience to us, having felt for some time the severity of our laws formerly inflicted, would either by our clemency have been moved, or out of their own judgment have learned, to forbear to provoke us to any sharper course of proceeding, and not have so notoriously abused our mercy as they have done : for, whilst we, in our princely commiseration, and pity of their seduced blindness, held this so mild and merciful hand over them, they, in the meantime, greatly forgetting our patience and lenity, have sought, like unfaithful subjects, the utter ruin both of us and our kingdom, to the uttermost of their abilities. It is apparent to the world with how great malice of late our kingdom of Ireland hath been invaded by the King of Spain, and how Don Giovan [Don Juan D'Aguilar], his chief commander, published a warrant from the See of Rome, to deprive us of our crown, and to proclaim his master lord of the same : the Spaniards themselves having not only declared, but afterwards bitterly complained, in their

¹ Tierney, iv. p. 3, note Gunpowder Treason ; Jardine ; Eudæmon Ioann. ; Coudrette, i. 243.

miseries and distresses, that the secular priests and Jesuits have, both of them, invited the king, their master, to that unfortunate enterprise, by abusing him grossly by reporting our forces to be so contemptible, and their own party so powerful, as the conquest of that realm was most assured. And that we might not conceive any better hopes of them hereafter, it is in like sort made manifest to the greatest part of Europe, as we suppose, by their own books, lately published, that they have already very maliciously and wickedly combined themselves together, in this our realm, for the advancement of our enemies, the perverting our subjects, and, as much as in them lies, the subversion of our estate Besides, such is their pride and presumption, as that they thrust themselves into all the affairs of our estate, adventuring, in their writings and speeches, to dispose of our kingdoms and crown at their pleasures. If any of their own sort, being of a milder temper, as moved in conscience, do but seem to acknowledge the lenity of our proceedings and government, it is a sufficient cause of their hatred and revenge, to pursue and prosecute them as their enemies : and lest the generation of those wickedly disposed persons should, in time, be rooted out and decay, they make a usual market of transporting the youth of our realm unto foreign seminaries, thereby to corrupt the best families, and to hatch up a succeeding brood like to themselves, that by libelling, treachery, and all kinds of traitorous practices, they may still seek and endeavour to perturb and molest us.¹

¹ In a letter to Parsons, in 1605, Garnet says : " The party that promised a hundred marks per annum is in such want, that I may not urge it. For the new house of prentices [the noviciate at Louvain] I had provided some several persons, who were come up to London : bnt I have sent them back to the spring. Sicklemore is a great suitor, and Holtby entreateth for him. He is, of

And whereas, of late, much contention and controversy hath arisen between the Jesuits and secular priests dissenting from them in divers points, on the other part, thereby a great difference of offence against us and our state, betwixt one and the other sect, hath manifestly appeared; the Jesuits and the secular priests, their adherents, seeking and practising by their continual plots and designs, not only to stir up foreign princes against us, to the invasion and conquest of our kingdom, but also even to murder our person; the other secular priests not only protesting against the same, as a thing most wicked, detestable, and damnable, but also offering themselves, in their writings and speeches, to be the first that shall discover such traitorous intentions against us and our state, and to be the foremost by arms and all other means to suppress it,—so as it is plain that the treason, which is locked in the hearts of the Jesuits and their adherents, is fraughted with much more violent malice, perils, and poison, both against us and our state, than that disloyalty and disobedience which is found in the other secular priests, that are opposite therein unto them Furthermore, we cannot conjecture, but do wonder, upon what grounds they proceed, except it be our sufferance and benignity which is greatly neglected by them.¹ And to the further aggravating of this

good talents and strength of body, and now qualified, as they say, in his choler. I pray you send word if you will have him.”—*MS. in Tierney*, iv. *Append.* xvi. p. 102.

¹ Garnet, speaking of James's persecution, says: “The courses taken are more severe than in Bess's time.”—*Ibid. ut antea*. According to the proclamation, it would even appear that the Jesuits believed that the queen was about to grant toleration—whereat she wonders, and which she indignantly denies: still it shows “that the courses taken in Bess's time” were only severe on emergencies of “stirs”—a proof that it rested with the teachers whether the disciples were to be tormented or not. In truth, the blood of the slaughtered Catholics

their audacious boldness, we find that their said conceit of a toleration is accompanied with very great liberty and intolerable presumption, in that they dare adventure to walk in the streets at noon-days, to resort to prisons publicly, and execute their functions in contempt of our laws, never ceasing, the one side as well as the other, by these and many more their intolerable proceedings, to waken our justice, which, for the respect before-mentioned, hath lain in a slumber; where in all good policy, it had been their parts, if ever, by a far contrary course, to have prescribed to themselves the strictest rules and cautions of giving any such notorious scandals to so notable clemency, never moved but by constraint to think upon any severity:—from the which our said mild and merciful connivance toward such unthankful and inconsiderate persons, we find this further mischief proceeding, that some other natures, apt to innovation and affected much to their own opinions, have broken forth, on the other side, into factious invectives in print against our present government, whereunto they repute such remissness, as if no care were had by any but a few of themselves, to preserve religion; of which pamphlets, or any other to come forth in like kind, we would quickly make the authors (if they were laid open) to feel the weight of our indignation, in presuming to take upon them to censure our government, according to their vain conceits, whereby they both

is on the heads of Allen, his Seminarists, the pope, and the Jesuits—as well as on the hands that shed it on the “principle” of expedience. In May, 1601, Henry IV. wrote to D'Ossat as follows: “The Queen of England having caused the execution of the parties guilty of the conspiracy of the Earl of Essex, begins to evince clemency and mildness towards the rest, as much on account of the rank and great number of the accomplices, as by her natural disposition, which is averse to bloodshed and severity.”—*Letres*, v.; *Additional Letters*, p. 46.

injure our innocence, and scandalise many good and zealous persons, which are free from their unquiet humours, though opposite to the adverse party." Thus it appears that the queen's connivance at the practices of the Jesuits and others in England, had made her obnoxious to the vituperations of the Protestant fanatics. In fact, it is certain that the "audacious boldness" of the Jesuits carried them to extraordinary lengths indeed. Their sovereign will made all things lawful to their "right intention"—*recta intentio*; and the details of their "probable" deeds would be highly interesting, could we come at the facts indicated by the following words of the Jesuit Garnet to Parsons, in 1605—and not even in the winking days of "Bess's time :"—

"I pray you send word how many coadjutors you will have. I have one, a citizen of London, of very good experience, which may benefit us, in *buying and selling without taxes*. But he is fifty years old :—and I think it not amiss to have, at the first, some ancient men for such. Send your will herein."¹ The proclamation concluded with banishing the Jesuits, so as to "avoid, in some sort, all these inconveniences, mischiefs, murmurings, and heart-burnings in this realm." The queen "required and charged all Jesuits and secular priests, combined together as is before expressed, who were at liberty within the realm (by whose sole act of

¹ "A short but separate paragraph of three lines is here carefully obliterated," says Mr. Tierney. Garnet thus concludes his letter : "I am in wonderful distress, for want of the ordinary allowance from Joseph [Creswell, the Jesuit-superior in Spain, as Mr. Tierney suspects]. I pray you write for all the arrearages, which if it may all be gotten, I can spare you some. Thus, with humble remembrance to Claud [thus he styles General Aquaviva], yourself, Fabio, Perez, Duras, and the rest—I cease, 4^o Octobris. My hostesses both and their children salute you. Sir Thomas Tresham is dead."—*MS. apud Tierney*, iv. *Append.* xvii. p. 106. Of the obliterated paragraph more anon.

their very coming into this kingdom they were within the danger of the laws), that they should forthwith depart out of the queen's dominions and territories, and not by their abode any longer provoke her majesty to extend the rigour of the laws upon them." The secular priests, though "in some things opposite unto the Jesuits," were also banished "except such of them as shall, in the meantime, present themselves to some of the lords or others of our privy council, to our president of Wales and York, or to the bishops of the diocese, and, before them acknowledging sincerely their duty and allegiance unto us, shall submit themselves to our mercy ; with whom we will then (upon certificate from the president and bishop, which we require to be sent up to our council, within twenty days after such submission) take such further order, as shall be thought by us to be most meet and convenient."¹ Thirteen secular priests hastened to avail themselves of this privilege. In an admirable address, drawn up by Dr. William Bishop, they thanked the queen for her merciful consideration, and signified their readiness to give her the satisfaction which she required. They acknowledged her for their queen, holding her power from the word of God, and possessing a claim to their allegiance, which "no authority, cause, or pretence," could set aside :

¹ Rymer, xvi. 473 ; Dodd, iii. Append. xxxv. It was on the 24th July of the same year, 1602, that Beaumont, the French ambassador, said in his report : "It is not necessary to be a bad subject in order to be a good Christian. Obstinacy, bad disposition, indiscreet zeal for the Catholic religion, have brought that sect [the Jesuits] in England to destruction. They not merely refused to acknowledge and obey the queen, but entered into conspiracies of all kinds against her person, and into alliances with enemies of the kingdom, in order to effect her downfall. Thus, instead of earning from her indulgence, protection, and support, they have provoked the queen in such fashion, that she was compelled, on behalf of her own security, to practise severity, and to take from them all liberty."—*Raumer*, ii. 183, 184.

they declared their abhorrence of the many forcible attempts already made to restore the Catholic religion, and their determination not only to stand by their sovereign against her future opponents, but also to reveal to her whatever conspiracies or treasons might come to their knowledge ; they protested that, if, for the discharge of this sacred duty, the pope should even venture to excommunicate them, they should feel themselves bound, in the sight of God, to disregard the sentence ; and they concluded by expressing a hope that, whilst they thus rendered to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, they should not be condemned, if they declared their resolution to fulfil the other portion of the precept—to yield to the successor of Peter that obedience which Peter himself might have claimed under the commission of Christ, and so to distinguish between their several duties and obligations, as to be ready, on the one hand, “to spend their blood in the defence of her majesty,” but, on the other, “rather to lose their lives than infringe the lawful authority of Christ's Catholic Church.”¹ If these sentiments of patriotic loyalty were sincere—and we are glad to believe them such—we have only to regret that it required forty-five years of failure and suffering to inspire them. Had such a demonstration taken place at the accession of Elizabeth, and had been honestly followed up with the conduct it promised, incalculable calamities and iniquities on both sides of the “religious” contest would have been forefended from humanity. Elizabeth lived not to see the result : on the very day on which this loyal instrument was signed, she was seized with that illness which in less than three months terminated her existence. On the

¹ Tierney, iii. 55. He gives the whole document, Append. xxxvi.

24th of March, 1603, "the queen very gently resigned her spirit." Forty-five long years she had reigned—in defiance of eight popes who took a *deadly* interest in her fate—in spite of Philip II., who hated her most intensely and vowed her to destruction—saved from the hands of innumerable traitors and assassins—protected from the Jesuits—to whom her name has ever been wormwood and a curse. It is an interesting character, and deserves a momentary reflection.

Pope Sixtus V. said that "if Elizabeth were not a heretic she would be worth a world"—but the point of papal admiration was Elizabeth's determined policy in crushing all opposition, even as evidenced by her conduct towards the Catholic factions and their dupes.¹ For our part, deep as must be our admiration of Queen Elizabeth, it would be infinitely enhanced in our minds had she contrived to dislodge the spirit of Rome without persecution. It was, however, too much to be expected—at a time when the elements of superstition were so universal, and ready to be made destructive by any pope, priest, or Jesuit—against any king, queen, or heretic. And yet, incongruous as it may seem, Elizabeth was the pattern of a most liberal toleration in the matter of religious opinions, as long as they were not interpreted into opposition to her political power—which was just a degree below despotism—nor improperly so, at a time when the utmost promptitude and vigour were indispensable in the executive. Nevertheless, Catholic lords enjoyed her favours and privileges—when she thought she could trust them:—the very mansion now possessed and enjoyed by the Jesuits in England, was built by a Catholic courtier with Elizabeth's

¹ See Raumer, *Hist. of 16th and 17th Cent.* i. 294.

express permission,—nay, she permitted him to retain a priest in his retinue. In the hands of Elizabeth, persecution was a political expedience: its “martyrs” were traitors, actual or contingent. This assertion detracts from the glory of the martyrologies—but is it not attested by all the facts and sentiments which I have quoted from Catholic writers themselves? Has it not been evident that under the cloak of religion a ceaseless machination was carried on by the Jesuits and their Spanish faction to dethrone, to murder Elizabeth, and give her kingdom to the Spaniard? I question whether any king or queen, even of the present day, would be less severe than Elizabeth under the circumstances on all sides admitted. I believe that she had too much sense to be a bigot in religion. The castigation she administers in her last proclamation, on those over-zealous Protestants who, “according to their vain conceits,” taxed her with “remissness” in the cause of religion, plainly shows that Elizabeth mastered the Protestant party as well as the Catholic faction. The bigotry of Protestantism found no encouragement in Queen Elizabeth. In truth, she saw too well the effects of Catholic bigotry around her, to nourish an equally fierce hydra when permitted to roam at large, “seeking whom it may devour.” To Elizabeth be awarded the honour and glory of having reduced ecclesiastical power and influence to the small dimensions, which they should ever have in a free constitution.¹ Indulging her peculiar

¹ On the other hand, she strenuously opposed all attempts at meddling with the abuses of the ecclesiastical courts. It were absurd to suppose that she approved of those abuses: but the fact was, it was not the time to make herself more “religious” enemies than she had in hand. It would indeed have been a piece of infatuation to exasperate her “Church” against herself. Was she not aware that this was exactly what the Pope of Rome did, by empowering Wolsey to

fancies and judgment—which bowed to no human authority—she seemed inclined to countenance many Romish practices and opinions—such as the use of images—fasting—the real presence—the celibacy of the clergy ;—but a moment’s consideration will enable us to conclude, that her aim was to superinduce more strictness and regularity in the Protestant clergy, could she succeed in effecting the adoption of these practices and opinions. Something, it appeared, was wanting to keep the Protestant clergy and laity within the bounds of religious and moral decorum—and the adoption of these opinions and practices seemed conducive to that end so desirable. It was an error, of course, as experience in the very heart of Catholicism too plainly attested—but something was to be done—and that was what Elizabeth aimed at, in seeming to favour Catholic practices and opinions in the *concrete*—for in the *abstract*, it may be safely said that she was totally indifferent to the human interpretations of revelation. Practical good was her aim perpetually : political even in her pleasures, was it to be expected that she should be otherwise in the restraints of “religion” ? She enforced abstinence from flesh-meat at certain times. That was a “popish” practice :—but this practical queen took good care to undeceive the archbishops and clergy as to any ulterior notions that might be entertained thereanent. “And

torment the monks in their abuses ? The consequences of that false step of expedient concession, by the infatuated Clement VII., was one of the most powerful promoters of Henry VIII.’s convulsive “Reformation.” Elizabeth was wise : abuses are bad things—but Elizabeth had quite enough to do in keeping out the abuses of Rome—for the present. She would have reformed the Church had she found the kingdom in the state in which she left it : to have exasperated the churchmen, would have given her enemies new accomplices. The popes of Rome never could honestly allege this excuse for winking at the very peculiar abuses which disgraced Catholicism.

further declare unto them," she said by an order of council, "that the same is not required for any liking of popish ceremonies heretofore used, which *utterly are detested*; but only to maintain the *mariners, and the navy of this land, by setting men a fishing.*"¹

The kingdom was never so depressed in reputation, or in so dangerous a condition both at home and abroad, as when Elizabeth came to the throne. It was incumbered with the debts of her father, her brother, her sister. The royal navy was neglected and out of repair. The nation was embroiled in intestine heats of religion. Philip of Spain was aspiring to unlimited dominion in and out of Europe. Elizabeth paid all those debts of her predecessors: regulated her finances. "Never was there a prince," says Castelnau, five times ambassador at the English Court, "never was there a prince who amassed so much wealth, so justly acquired, as she has done—without imposing any new tax or subsidy, which is a sufficient reason for showing that avarice was not her dominant passion, as people have wished to lay to her charge; and for eight years she has not demanded the dues and bounties which England is wont to make to its king every three years; and what is more, in the year 1570, her subjects having offered to pay them, she not only thanked them without consenting to receive anything, but also assured them that she would never raise five shillings on them, except for the maintenance of the state, or when necessity should require the demand. This act alone," says Castelnau, "deserves much praise, and may deserve for her the title of liberal." Nevertheless, there are those who talk incessantly of Elizabeth's "parsimony"—her reluctance to maintain a

¹ Collier ii. ; apud Dodd, iii. 64.

standing army, so dreadfully voracious and otherwise objectionable. For my part, I believe that the highest praise is due to Queen Elizabeth for the fact, that she maintained her kingdom in vast prosperity, defeated all the schemes of her enemies, and yet spent very little money on armies in actual service, or in readiness for service, in the kingdom. How she learnt that policy we know not, except that it was the result of her solid good sense, which was never afterwards copied by her immediate successors, who retained the same degree of despotism, without a single ray of that good sense which made Elizabeth so essentially a Queen of England. Willingly should we consent to the same amount of royal power at the present day, if wielded by the intellect and heart of an Elizabeth. Perhaps, never since then have the true interests of all—nobility, people, and clergy, been so ably and justly managed. We gained by utterly neutralising royal authority, because there was at the time great danger of its being abused : but we certainly gained nothing by throwing it so exclusively into the brains or the hands of hundreds, over whom we have not the check which might be exerted over one sovereign—powerful, but still responsible to the people. How admirable the thought, when a sovereign is towards the people, an executive, a council-ruling mind ! How soon would all abuses, of which thousands, if not millions, complain, vanish at such an advent of a saviour in the present alarms of the nation ! Such would become the nation's enthusiasm at the glorious fact, that all the beggarly motives of party, would be merged and sunk for ever in the beautiful Pacific of national affection to a national queen. It is as senseless and cruel as it is absurd, to condemn admirable natural

abilities to perform the functions of a mere automaton, pulled by strings. Let the sovereign *be* a sovereign—and this nation will be a nation—instead of a medley of parties, whose councils are confusion worse confounded, more swayed by the organs of party than by the law itself, and certainly not by the best and noblest sentiments which constitute the birthright of Englishmen, such as those on whom Elizabeth could depend. Many talk of their affection to the queen : but it is only a set form of speech : it cannot be felt, plainly because the queen is too far removed from her loyal people. What *can* she do to deserve her nation's applause, whilst her functions are confined to the mere signing of bills or subscriptions for charitable purposes ? Let the queen *be* a queen in the fullest sense of the term, and the nation will be at rest. There is now-a-days no fear of abuse in the royal prerogative in a sovereign of England. It will increase her Majesty's duties : but the noble motive which will thus be held forth, both to herself and a grateful nation, will eventuate results that must compensate for all anxiety or toil in the head that governs a great people, prosperous and free.

Constituted the representative of the Protestant movement or resistance, Queen Elizabeth amply repaid the pope and Philip for all their evil attempts and intentions. Doubtless self-defence was a strong motive in the queen ; but in her it was no selfishness, since the glorious welfare of a great nation depended on the life and power of their queen.¹ Whilst Elizabeth and God's

¹ In his report of April, 1603, Beaumont, Henry IV.'s ambassador, says : " Elizabeth might, beyond doubt, have concluded a peace with Spain, had she chosen it. But this spirit is that which we cannot sufficiently admire in her, that (contrary to the wont of all aged sovereigns, who look only to their enjoyments, and seek on such alone to raise their monuments), she only aspired to

elements kept war from the plains of England, her men and her fleets on every land and every sea battled with the fierce invader of the world's rights : their practical watchword was, down with papal and Spanish domination : it was only fair that these sailors and these troops should be paid for their work : they *were* paid—but at the expense of the enemy. After a reign of five and forty years, during which time she subsidised the Huguenots and the Hollanders, and kept afloat a powerful fleet roaming every sea, yet did the queen leave the kingdom in peace within, and in a martial condition—full of honour and reputation abroad—the royal navy not only superior to any in the world in strength, but in admirable repair ; few debts left charged on the crown, and large contingencies from a wealthy people, forthcoming for service done, and rebellion crushed, or the invader baffled and beaten. There were above two millions four hundred thousand pounds due from the States of Holland, for enabling them to achieve their righteous independence against the execrable tyrant of Spain.¹ What a contrast to our modern method of subsidising ! England's people have been made to fight and lavish millions for the interests of foreigners, with only a very questionable glory, by way of a *per contra*, for solid gold by the million, and generous lives by the same computation. Napoleon undertook to make a war of aggression sup-

found hers on toil, and honour, and victory, and to bury herself under trophies. Ungrateful as her successor and her subjects show themselves at this moment towards her, every one must yet acknowledge that the former owes his elevation, the latter their welfare and preservation, to the queen.”—*Raumer*, ii. 194, 195.

¹ Coke, *Detection*, i. p. 1, *et seq.* As has ever been the usual return for England's subsidies, the Dutch, induced by a faction, attempted to be ungrateful to Elizabeth and her country ; but, by her promptitude, she effectually brought them to their senses, and they “begged pardon ” most humbly as in duty bound. Then she required them to pay for her services.

port itself, and the trick was considered a mighty fine "idea." Elizabeth ruined her enemies at their own expense, and built up the paltry nation of Holland into a pyramid of power, to complete the destruction of that enemy, on whom she thus inflicted a providential retribution.¹ Possessed of absolute power, endowed with all the great qualities which constitute the natural right to command, still she would never pronounce a decision, nor uphold an opinion, without the concurrence of her council. This is the testimony of Castelnau, and it is well worth quotation against the very questionable and interested authorities whereby Dr. Lingard misrepresents this quality of Elizabeth's mind, under the name of "irresolution." In truth, the doctor seems to have steeped his mind in the peculiar juices of the Jesuit Parsons, in delivering his "character" of Queen Elizabeth. Castelnau, five times ambassador at the court, contradicts the "impartial" doctor, in every blasting element of the character which he has fulminated against the nation's queen.

"Never has a prince loved his subjects more than I

¹ Elizabeth refused to accept the sovereignty of the United Provinces when she took them into her protection, after the expulsion of the Duke d'Anjou, and the death of the Prince of Orange; but she justly entered into a treaty with the States in 1585, wherein it was agreed that the Dutch should repay her all the moneys which she should expend for their preservation, with interest at ten *per cent.*, when the war was ended with Spain, and that two Englishmen, to be named by the queen, should be admitted into their council of state. Flushing, Rammekens, and Brielle, were delivered up to the queen by way of security: these towns were the keys of the country. Elizabeth, enhancing her energetic assistance, gave the Hollanders the privilege of fishing on the coast of England—removed the staple of the English woollen manufactures from Antwerp, in the power of Spain, to Delft, in the power of the Dutch; "and 'tis scarce credible how, in so short a time, viz. scarce thirteen years, the Dutch, entertaining all sorts of people who were persecuted upon the account of not submitting to the papal usurpations (call'd religion), swelled their trade and navigation, not only in Europe, but in the East and West Indies."—*Coke, Detection*, i. 1—5.

do, and no jewel, no treasure, no happiness of any kind, can counterbalance the value of this affection!" exclaimed Elizabeth, when, in 1601, representations were made to her respecting the abuses of the monopolies which she had granted. "It is my intention to remedy all abuses, and to punish those who have illegally perverted my gifts, and oppressed their fellow citizens. But Heaven, I hope, will not impute their faults to me, who am innocent. For, remembering the supreme Judge, to whom I must give an account, I have always endeavoured to promote the good of my people. Nor do I wish to live any longer than while my government is for the advantage of all; and, though there have been in England more powerful and wiser princes, there never was, nor will be in future, one who had more care and affection for his people." The loudest joy and universal expressions of gratitude followed this declaration of Elizabeth, and she took care that her promise should be carried into effect.¹ "The highest praise is due to Elizabeth," says the Frenchman Mezerai, "for the ardent affection with which she cherished her people—a virtue which may cover all the other vices of a sovereign."² The French ambassador, Beaumont, exclaimed:—"the queen is not merely loved, but adored!"³

Unquestionably the courts of High Commission for the cognizance of religious offences;—the Star Chamber, for the punishment of what Dr. Lingard calls "that comprehensive and undefinable transgression, contempt of royal authority;"—and other expedient contrivances, after the manner of Rome and Spain,—unquestionably

¹ Raumer, *Polit. Hist.* i. 376, *et seq.* Hallam, following Dr. Ewes, gives a somewhat different account, i. 261.

² Mezerai, vi. p. 283.

³ Raumer, *ubi supra*.

these contrivances are lamentable blots on the reign of Elizabeth—but so are all the pontifical and Spanish and Jesuitical contrivances which suggested them—blots on humanity all of them ; and whilst Protestants may denounce them, Catholics have no right to do so, seeing that they were not original contrivances by the royal council of England, but vile transplantations from the hot-beds of Rome and of Spain. No one can deny that the queen and government were in a constant state of alarm from “religious” traitors ; and whilst we denounce the cruelties which attended the measures of self-defence, we must be permitted still more to denounce the atrociously unchristian schemes and attempts, which directly suggested such contrivances. What shall we say of the captivity and execution of Mary Queen of Scots, after seeing the attestation of the intended murder of Elizabeth, for which she agreed to pay a sum of money ? Only this, that the queen and her council were selfish and provident of the country’s welfare—whilst Mary and her faction were equally selfish—but also recklessly infatuated, cowardly, base, and, therefore, as unworthy of sympathy as Elizabeth and her council may be obnoxious to blame.

The results of Protestantism were gloriously promoted and expanded by Elizabeth—in the vast improvement of agriculture—internal trade—and foreign commerce. Philip’s tyranny ruined the Netherlands : Elizabeth received and tolerated the fugitives. New manufactures, of various kinds, energetically advanced the nation’s onward march to supremacy amongst the most industrious, the wealthiest of earth. The Royal Exchange of London—built by one of her subjects—became the centre of commerce extending over Europe,

and to Barbary, Morocco, Guinea, and Turkey. Her sailor, Willoughby, actually discovered Archangel—and a Russian trading company was established. Frobisher, Davis, Raleigh, Drake, and Cavendish, are names of high renown :—these men were Elizabeth's discoverers for the world, which they circumnavigated at no expence to the nation, because they had to fight their way on the papal seas of the Spanish despot—and brought home solid equivalents as well as contributions to "the diffusion of knowledge." Some call them pirates—but, if they were, they robbed from a thief—the King of Spain—that wholesale pirate among the Indians.

Elizabeth defrayed all annual expenses with five hundred thousand pounds. The great she rewarded with words : but she made ample provision for the widows and orphans of those who fell in war. During her reign of five-and-forty years, the Parliament granted her only three millions of pounds as subsidies—subsidies, be it remembered, imperatively necessary to defend the nation from the Spaniards, fooled into their rash attempts by the pope and the Jesuits and their faction of Catholic exiles.¹

Need I enlarge on that laurelled band of mentalists—poetic philosophers and philosophical poets who wrote and sang for the admiration of the Virgin Queen and all posterity ? A Bacon was the offspring of that expansive reign—destined to achieve for the whole circle of the sciences what his queen so nobly began and strove to consolidate for her country and for universal Protestantism—since in every realm that movement felt the genial touch of her hearty hand—or heard a cheer from the imperial Virgin of the Isle. And Shakspeare, too, sang joyously then—a universe of mentality, whom,

¹ Raumer, *ut antea*, p. 381.

as the Gospel, we never read without fresh thoughts of delight and comfort.¹

“Some gentler passions steal into my mind,
(For I am soft and made of melting snow)
Or be more cruel, Love, or be more kind,
Let me or float or sink, be high or low :
Or let me live with some more sweet content,
Or die, and so forget what love e'er meant.”

These verses were composed by Elizabeth. The object of their introduction is evident—a few remarks are necessary on the foul aspersions recorded against Elizabeth. Lingard, on the strength of two very questionable authorities, talks of Elizabeth's “feelings blunted by passion,”—states that she was “regardless of her character and callous to every sense of shame,”—he mentions one “indecent act,”—numbers her paramours—and sums up the horrible account by saying: “and it was afterwards believed that her licentious habits survived, even when the fires of wantonness had been quenched by the chill of age:”—these be “prave words” for a virgin priest. Castelnau, a distinguished, a disinterested Frenchman, a personal witness of long-standing at the English Court, is, at least equal to Lingard's *Spanish* ambassador and *partisan* authorities. “And if they have wished to tax her falsely with love or lust (amour) I will say with truth that these are the forged inventions of her evil-wishers and her enemies

¹ “But with whom shall we compare the unrivalled Shakspeare,” says Raumer, “or whom shall we place above him? From the tenderest emotions to the most sublime energy, from the most playful humour to prophetic dignity, he commands the whole scale of feeling and of thought; and while so many renowned poets erect their throne on a small section of the magic circle of poetry, beyond which they are unable to pass, he lavishes his inexhaustible treasures in all directions, and commands the admiration of the most simple, as well as the most cultivated minds.”

in the *cabinets of the ambassadors*, in order to disgust those to whom her alliance would have been useful” Touching her unwillingness to marry, he says : “ She has told me numberless times, and long before I was resident at her Court, that even to save her life she would not consent to marry any one but a prince of a great and illustrious house, and not inferior to her own—more for the benefit of her country than any particular inclination of her own ; and if she thought that any of her subjects was presumptuous enough to desire her for a wife, she would never see him, but, contrary to her nature which had no cruelty in it, she would punish him. So that there is no reason to disbelieve that she was as chaste as she was prudent, as effects demonstrate.” His reasoning on the subject is interesting. “ A good proof of this is the curiosity which she had to learn so many sciences and foreign languages ; and her being so constantly employed in affairs of state, that she could not have had time to yield to amorous passions, which have nothing in common with literature—as the ancients have wisely shown when they made Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, a virgin and without a mother, and the muses chaste and maidens.¹ Never-

¹ “ She was very learned,” says Hénault. “ One day when she was visited by Calignon, who was Chancellor of Navarre, she showed him a Latin translation which she had made of certain tragedies of Sophocles ; also two orations of Demosthenes. She also permitted him to take a copy of a Greek epigram which she had composed ; and she asked his opinion on certain passages of Lycophron, which she then had in her hand, and some passages of which she was desirous to translate :—but her greatest science was that of reigning, and England numbers her amongst her greatest kings.”—*Abrégé*, ii. p. 614. These acquirements were not incompatible with the pursuits suggested by licentious appetite, but they were certainly a powerful beacon-light, a stimulus to the intellect of the nation. The queen’s example roused the minds of her people to intellectual effort. Hence the unrivalled power of thought which was established in English science and literature during that truly glorious reign—a power of thought which still

theless, adds the moralist, “courtiers say that honour, especially that of women, consists in its reputation only, which makes those fortunate who have a good one. And if I have permitted myself to enlarge in the praise of this queen, the particular knowledge I have had of her merits will be my lawful excuse; the recital has seemed necessary to me, in order that the queens who shall succeed her may have as a mirror the example of her virtues, should these Memoirs, against my intention, ever see the light.”¹

But, on the other hand, even assuming that those men whom Lingard names, were the “mistresses,” as it were, of Queen Elizabeth, what a wonderful contrast stands before us! Whilst popes and kings have burthened their kingdom with the support of *their* mistresses, those of Elizabeth will appear before us as energetic servants of the country—*exhausting their wealth* in the service of their queen—ever eager at her bidding to risk fortune and life to please that wonderful queen, whom we may truly call the mistress of all her loyal people—for she truly loved them all intensely. This, then, is the mighty gist of the argument:—assuming the fact, in a political point of view, Elizabeth stands forth rather an object of admiration than blame:—but I doubt the fact altogether. That the queen was well-beloved, is beyond all doubt: that her gentle heart loved equally well:—that the country—that all her people derived benefit from that affection which she turned to their account so nobly—all this is beyond all doubt—but Queen Elizabeth was *not* the infamous thing of Lingard’s imagining. The

attracts us to the minds of that age, and well it might, from the meaningless, shallow platitudes of the present.

¹ Castelnau, Mem. (Pantheon Litt. p. 127—8.) He was the negotiator of the projected marriage between the queen and the Duke d’Anjou. Ib.

political consequences entailed upon a nation so disastrously by kings, through their royal mistresses—especially Henry IV. and Louis XIV.—render this feature in their character of *historical moment* : but this excuse cannot be alleged by Lingard for soiling his pages with the foe-concocted infamy he flings on an admirable queen. In lashing *Anne Boleyn*, he was right—for the consequences of her guilt were *political*, as well as injurious to the happiness of another woman—and a virtuous queen : but not a shadow of such impeachment can be alleged against Elizabeth—except from the murky brains of the Jesuit Parsons and his Spanish faction. Nay, Elizabeth, far from being compromised to any of these “favoured” ones, actually consigned one of them to execution when he presumed to be a traitor to his country. If he was base enough to commit that crime, he would not have shrunk from threatening the queen with a public exposure in self-defence, had she been, by guilt, in his power. He did nothing of the sort—and this is another argument in favour of Elizabeth respecting one of the *most* “favoured” ones ;—nor would Elizabeth, I think, have ventured to put the fellow to the extremity, had she yielded to the infamy so plainly suggested by Lingard. Further, nothing but the most prurient and vindictive “religious” feeling could have induced the doctor to repeat the silly tale of a “son” of Elizabeth, whose generation he found in the *Archives of Simancas*, with other documents of the rancorous and baffled and beaten Spaniards.¹

¹ See Lingard, viii. 406, and Append. note x. Nay, the very dread of becoming a mother under the apprehension of dying in childbed, as her physicians were induced to predict, was one of the motives advanced by Elizabeth against her consenting to marry. I need not apply the argument : “*Et alioqui tota vita cœlebs à nuptiis abhorruit, ab iis, qui circa eam erant, quò magis ipsam in*

The queen's influence over the nation at large was felt benignly. All was advancement,—all was improvement,—and nowhere the bleak stagnation of the olden time. Rapidly, uninterruptedly, the nation sped forward to wealth, glory, and renown. The palaces displayed equal magnificence and taste, and paintings or fine tapestry adorned the rooms and beautified the halls. The usual mode of life was simple and moderate, but on festive occasions, on the visits of foreign ambassadors, and the like *national* calls for display, Elizabeth was fond of showing forth her royal splendour. Then it was that magnificent processions, elegant ballets, comedies, and tragedies, alternated with serious conversations. “As wisdom and secrecy appeared in her council, so hospitality, charity, and splendour were diluted over the whole court”—never were heart and mind more admirably attuned to unison, or rather, in beautiful concord. It cannot be denied that Elizabeth, fully conscious of the superiority of her understanding, aimed too much, perhaps, at making an impression by her beauty; and too unmindful of the chilling hand of time, wished to retain externally the youthful vigour of her mind—but there are those amongst women, whose minds and whose hearts time furrows not—and if their features have lost the smile so bewitching, their minds and their

potestate habent, injecto per medicorum suggestionem metu, si conciperet fore, ut in puerperio moreretur.”—*Thuanus*, lib. cxxix. Surely Dr. Lingard must have read the note at p. 435, of D'Ossat's Letters, vol. ii., where the subject is alluded to physiologically, and in the plainest possible terms is affirmed the impossibility of what the doctor is pleased to throw out. Every one knows that when the Duke d'Alençon urged his suit with importunity, the queen exclaimed that she did not think she was so little beloved by her subjects as that they should wish to bury her before her time. D'Ossat's annotator, Amelot de la Houissaie, says “that the same physical cause which prevented her marrying, must have precluded licentiousness.”—*Lettre du 1 Fév. 1597*, note 11.

hearts smile on for ever : they know it—and are loath to resign the prerogative of exalted natures. But in spite of these little vanities and weaknesses, to which many persons have attached far too much importance, no court had yet been so polished, and so *moral*, so intelligent, and so romantic.¹ How far inferior, in every respect, was the otherwise so highly extolled court of France under Catherine de' Medici and her sons ! Let a Frenchman, and a Roman Catholic, the far-famed De Thou, give his opinion of Queen Elizabeth. "Elizabeth," he says, "was of a lofty mind and manly spirit—rapidly matured for the serious business of life by her early fortune. She governed by her own understanding, not through that of others ; ably combined moderation with prudence—was severe only to the arrogant and intractable nobility, but mild to all others. From the first to the last, she inspired the former with respect and the latter with affection—rewarding real merit in such a manner as made her favours seem a right to the deserving—frugal in expenditure lest she should oppress her people by exhausting taxes—far from being extravagant and intemperate in her enjoyments, she was not avaricious, but provident for the future. Cautious, and full of solicitude in the responsibilities so worthy of a sovereign, her deeds in the present were deposits against futurity. Cherishing peace at home, her wisdom and policy gave a vent to the warlike and ardent spirits of her people in battle-fields afar from her shores : she would prove to the world that although ruled by a

¹ Raumer. But Dr. Lingard, however, says : "The court imitated the manners of the sovereign. It was a place in which, according to Faunt, 'all enormities reigned in the highest degree,' or, according to Harrington, 'where there was no love, but that of the lusty god of gallantry, Asmodeus.'"

woman, the energies, the martial prowess, the renown of a people need suffer no diminution—nor were they ever impaired. Full of moderation, her mind was averse to severity and bloodshed; and, judging from her own feelings, she was no advocate for the compulsion of conscience. Yet did she object to grant that liberty of conscience which, under pretence of religion, would, in those times, disturb public tranquillity: when conspiracies became frequent, she sharpened the laws against the factious—but less from her own inclination than by the advice of her ministers, who feared as much for her safety as for their own, in the imminent perils which suggested the edicts. But these severities were inflicted more on the property, than the persons, of the proscribed factions: and thus she has been taxed with the charge of avarice, which ought rather to fall on her ministers, whilst her mercy in sparing the lives of offenders won for her no grateful acknowledgment. In the destruction of the Spaniard's armada—the preparation of so many years, and at so vast an outlay—her good fortune was eminently conspicuous; for it was dispersed by aid from on high rather than the arms of men,—and the Spaniard's ambition and his iniquitous covetousness of empire were visited with providential retribution—condemned by a judgment of heaven.

“Elizabeth was apt at learning and eager for knowledge: she knew Latin and spoke it with ease. German she spoke correctly from its similitude to her own language; her French was not without a foreign accent; but she conversed in Italian with the greatest elegance: she delighted in poetry and music.¹

¹ Her love of learning was so great and long-continued, that in her 65th year

“Many of the aspersions which have been heaped upon her by her religious enemies, have been greatly confuted by her long and happy reign, prosperous to the end, defended by the invisible arm of the Divinity.¹ It was her pleasure to be courted, and complimented for her beauty, and to *seem—videri*—occupied with love, even in her old age—renewing, as it were, by this mental pastime, the memory of those fabulous isles, whereon chivalrous worthies and stalwart heroes roamed, and manifested love, which she required to be divested, by generous virtue, of all its grossness.² By this policy, if

she translated Horace's Art of Poetry, and Plutarch's Treatise on Curiosity. She excelled on the virginals, and understood the most difficult music ; but dancing was her chief delight ; and in that exercise she displayed a grace and elasticity which were universally admired. She retained her partiality for it to the last : few days passed in which the young nobility of the court were not called to dance before their sovereign ; and the queen herself condescended to perform her part in a galliard with the Duke of Nevers, in her 69th year.—*Raumer and Lingard*, and their authorities.

¹ It is curious to find that this generous argument in favour of Elizabeth's protracted reign of prosperity, has been turned against her by a modern Jesuit. Gioberti says that one of the modern Jesuits, addressing a congregation, told the devotees, that when Elizabeth began to reign, God offered her the choice between a short and difficult reign, with heaven beyond ; or a long and prosperous one, with the other place in reserve hereafter. The queen, said the Jesuit, chose the latter prospects ; and, to the present time, ever and anon there issues from the bottom of the Thames a voice mournfully crying : “O Queen, thou art damned ! O Queen, thou art damned !”—*Il Gesuita Moderno*. Surely this is not one of the facts in the modern *Annual Letters* of the English Jesuits ; however, it is “curious,” if not very “edifying.” But do not suppose that such legends were, in the olden time, confined to the “papists” and Jesuits. If you visit the castle of Framlingham, in Suffolk, they will show you a room where “the Bloody Mary brought forth a *serpent*.” Nay, they will show you the *image* of the same impressed upon the *wall against which it leaped*—and then vanished, I suppose to whence it originally came, which need not be named to “ears polite.”

² “Ambiri, coli ob formam, et amoribus etiam inclinâtâ jam ætate vacare *videri voluit*, de fabulosis insulis per illam relaxationem renovatâ quasi memoriâ, in quibus equites ac strenui homines errabant, et amores, foeditate omni prohibitâ generosè per virtutem exercebant.” Perhaps Hénault's idea is as near to the fact as any : “One of the greatest springs of Elizabeth's policy was to hold

she exposed her fair name to the aspersion of the malevolent, she did not diminish the majesty of royal power, in whose administration she never swerved from the right line of sovereignty. In her were seen noble virtues, worthy of the greatest king—and but few defects, and such as are excusable in her sex. Many sought to obscure her glory out of religious hatred, and ascribed to cruelty what she did only from necessity and her own safety ; so that to do away with the envy which some evince, nothing is wanted but time, which will in future prove to be the best panegyrist of Elizabeth, since nothing comparable to her is to be found in the history of the past, or will easily be found in that of the future.

“She was tall of stature and majestic, and enjoyed almost uninterrupted health to her extreme old age ; and then a placid, tranquil death ended her most prosperous life,—since no sadness, no wretchedness, no gloomy terror, no impatience of pain, no torment, no convulsions preceded :—but a few days before she expired, she suffered from that atony of the nervous system, whereby her voice, and mind, yielding with their shattered frame-work, were affected, and she gradually expired in the morning of the 24th of March, 1603.”¹

forth to all the princes of Europe, and even to some of her subjects, the bait of her marriage, and keep them all in subjection by that hope.”—*Hénault, Abrégé*, ii. 614. Truly it seems to me impossible to imagine that Elizabeth could *condescend* to debase herself by yielding to that which, of all things, most effectually humiliates and fetters woman. That conviction alone was enough to defend Elizabeth.

¹ Thuan. lib. cxxix. Various circumstances have been recorded of the last moments of Elizabeth : they are to be accounted for by her physical condition operating on a mind harassed by importunate questions respecting an event (the succession) which she had long refused to answer. The cruel besiegers of a death-bed have much to answer for in their heartless depravity. This is not

The History of the Reign of Elizabeth, with herself in the midst, its universal influence, is yet to be written. Justice has not been done to that splendid epoch of England's rule amongst the nations, when God announced her destiny. To Elizabeth belongs the glory of having evoked, promoted, and ratified that spirit of

the place to enter into the frivolous, the stupid, and hobgoblin argument, which even the "sagacious" Lingard would palm upon his readers; but I must be permitted to denounce the wicked craft of Charles Butler, who talked of "the gloom and mental agony which embittered the last days of *her*, by whose ministers the persecutions of the Catholics were devised"—and then he quotes, in proof of his opinion, what do you think? Why, "two letters written by the Emperor *Aurengzebe*, in his last moments," on the *vanity of human life*, and the *certainity of judgment!* And yet this man was a lawyer. What would he say if we groped up the dreadful deaths of many popes—and modern ones too—that is, since the Reformation? What would he say to the latter days of the famous Cardinal *Commendone*, whose "last moments," as related by his friend Gratiani, are a thousand times more humiliating than those of Elizabeth—and yet, who cries a "judgment?" I believe that in certain states of the body as it dwindles into death, dreadful thoughts, in health suppressed, will rise as ruthless furies to torment the guilty soul; but in the case of Elizabeth, neither the antecedent nor the consequent is made out—except in the judgment-seat of rancorous bigotry—such as lurks, though muffled, in the exquisitely sly "*Memoirs of the English Catholics*, by Charles Butler, of Lincoln's Inn." "But I supply as to her religious and Christian behaviour in her last sickness what this writer is silent in. She had several of her learned and pious bishops frequently about her, performing the last offices of religion with her, as particularly Watson, Bishop of Chichester, her almoner, the Bishop of London, and chiefly the archbishop, with whom in their prayers she very devoutly, both in her eyes, hands, and tongue, and with great fervency, joyned. She cared not to have any other discourse but with them, about her spiritual estate. And though she was impatient of any speeches of others with her, yet she was ever well pleased to hear the Archbishop and the Bishop of London give her comfort and council and goodword. And most heartily and devoutly prayed continually with them, and making signs and shows, to her last remembrance, of the sweet comfort she took in their presence and assistance, and of the unspeakable joy she was going into." . . . Then follows the prayer which was made for the dying queen. "Her death drawing near, the archbishop exhorted her to fix her thoughts upon God, the better to draw her mind from other, secular, things concerning her kingdom and successor, that some then of her court propounded to her. To which good advice to stay her at that hour, she answered him [that] she did so, nor did her mind wander from God. And as a sign thereof, when she could not speak, she was observed to lift up her eyes and hands to heaven."—*MS. Bish. Kennett's Coll. Bib. Lansd.* xlix. f. 23.

enterprise, persevering industry, elastic hopefulness, honest pride, and proud honesty, which have made this nation the physical, moral, and intellectual bank of the universe—just as its metropolis is, by its geographical position, the centre of the habitable earth—the veritable pole round about which the world of action revolves. It is the broad and long and deep foundation laid by Elizabeth, and the ministers she selected and governed, which has enabled the nation to suffer and emerge from moral, social, and political shocks, such as would havewhelmed any other, or left them to splinter or flounder in restless insecurity and irksome discontentment—as a neighbouring nation, by every revolution which has tried the temper of its metal, or the soundness of its hull. To trace the rise and progress of these splendid characteristics of the nation—to bring the argument home to the present time of dim uncertainty, when weak minds shiver and little ones croak despairingly, whilst all should be stirring in loyal energy as the men of Elizabeth—to *prove*, by the example of Elizabeth, that a people's advancement, prosperity, and happiness are proportioned to the immediate affection of their sovereign, from whom they are not set widely apart—whom they can bless for blessings received, to whom they can *really* and *truly* appeal for redress in their wrongs, for relief in their sufferings—to show forth these desirable truths, is a labour of love, to be achieved for the benefit of mankind. For, every nation of earth looks to Britain, as the mariner on trackless oceans chronicles his progress by the star of day on the meridian. A spirit-stirring theme—a glorious enterprise will it be, thus from the past, so ungratefully obscured, so perversely neglected, to evolve axioms of wisdom for the guidance

of the present unto prosperous contentment—to generate a future, whose glory and good shall be sufficient, if they but equal the glory and good of the loyal in the days of Elizabeth. From such a contemplation it is with sadness and regret that I must now pursue the troublous history of the Jesuits.

It is difficult to conceive the extent of that infatuation which impelled a section of the Jesuits, with Parsons at its head, to entertain the hope or the idea of changing the royal succession of England. How is it to be accounted for? By that confirmed perversity which never permits certain natures to resign a bad cause, and retrace their steps into the paths of honour or honesty—if they ever trod therein. For a comprehensive statement respecting the intrigue of the Spanish faction in the last years of Elizabeth, we must rely in full confidence on the unimpeachable authority of Cardinal D'Ossat.¹ In a letter written to Henry IV. in 1601, he thus exposes the views and position of the Jesuitico-

¹ Few historic characters have enjoyed the fame of this Frenchman. He was one of those extraordinary personages, says Butler, who have united every voice in their praise. He is mentioned in terms of equal favour by De Thou and Pallavicino, by Wicquefort in England, and the Jesuit Galucci at Rome, who pronounced his funeral oration. And his destiny was a moral—an encouragement to all who need the hope of worldly recompense for striving to perform to the utmost their duty as men—in which term every duty of God's creature is included. From a situation so low, that his family was never known, D'Ossat raised himself by his talents, and the undeviating wisdom and rectitude of his conduct, to be the vice-ambassador of Henry IV. of France to the See of Rome—the centre, at that time, of the most important negotiations. He possessed the entire confidence of his sovereign; and the pope, as an expression of his esteem, honoured him with the purple. "His penetration," says L'Avocat, "was prodigious. He formed his resolutions with such discernment, that in all the various concerns and negotiations in which he was engaged, a single false step has not been discovered." His letters, which minutely detail his diplomatic transactions, are so replete with solid judgment and practical wisdom, that they may be read with profit even by those who are not compelled to investigate the little things of mighty monarchs.

Spanish faction. “As far back as 1594 was published a book in English, which the Spaniards caused to be written by an English Jesuit, named Parsons, and circulated throughout England, the Netherlands, and everywhere else, where they thought that the book might prove useful to their views. Its object was and is to demonstrate and induce the world to believe, that for many hundred years there has not been in England either king or queen legitimately entitled to the crown : it excludes all the sovereigns of England on the score of having been guilty of high treason, or disinherited, or bastards, or heretics, or by reason of some other defect : consequently, it excludes from the succession to the throne of England, after the death of the reigning Queen, Elizabeth, all those who are of the blood royal of England—the nearest relatives of the queen, as the King of Scotland and Arabella, who are her nearest kindred Having thus excluded from the throne of England all the Scotch and English, this precious book strives to show that the true right to the throne lapsed to the late King of Spain, Philip II., then living, and to his children,—and it deduces the succession by two channels, affirming that the succession of England has lapsed to two families—the House of Brittany, and the House of Portugal :—the House of Brittany by reason of Constance, eldest daughter of William the Conqueror, King of England, who was married to Alain Fergeant I., Duke of Brittany—from which marriage the said book pretends that all the members of the House of Brittany have, to the present day, descended. Secondly,—to the House of Portugal, by reason of Philippa, daughter of Jean Le Grand, son of King Edward III. and Blanche, only daughter and heir of

Henry, Duke of Lancaster, third son of Edmond, the second son of Henry III., King of England. Philippa was married to John I., King of Portugal; from this marriage the book pretends that all the princes and princesses of the House of Portugal have, to the present day, descended. Now it follows, says this book, that all the rights and pretensions of the House of Brittany have centred in the person of the Infanta of Spain, who is married to the Archduke Albert :—therefore the right of succession to the crown of England belongs to the Infanta In like manner, says the book, all the rights and pretensions of the House of Portugal are merged in the person of the late King Philip II. of Spain, and his children :—therefore to him it was due, and to his children it is due to succeed to the throne of England. Now, although these propositions and their consequences are frivolous sophisms, and contrary to all right and custom, and partly false, yet, as your Majesty is aware, the late King of Spain always made a great deal of them, and directed all his thoughts to the scheme—as does the new king, his son.” And whilst these ridiculous genealogical discoveries did immense credit to the inventive genius of the Jesuit Parsons, the King of Spain made them weighty arguments by the solid largesses he flung to the Catholic exiles of England, who therefore advocated his Jesuitical pretensions. “To this end have aimed and still aim all the caresses, the pensions, the largesses, and other gifts, which the Spaniards have lavished and still lavish on the Catholics of England who are exiled on account of their religion, and have taken refuge not only in the Netherlands and in Spain, but also in France, in Italy, and elsewhere; but chiefly on those whom they think likely to prove ser-

viceable on account of their nobility, kindred, or alliance—or on account of their abilities and valour. Precisely to the same end and aim are the colleges and seminaries established by the Spaniards expressly for the English, at Douay, and at St. Omer's, where they receive the youths of the best families in England, in order to compel into their service the relatives and friends of these youths, whose influence and exertions are thus directed in England : the principal care of the teachers in these colleges and seminaries being to catechise, to nourish, to educate the said young gentlemen of England in the belief and firm faith that the late King of Spain possessed, and that his children now possess, the true right of succession to the crown of England ; and that it is thus useful and expedient for the Catholic religion, not only in England, but also all over Christendom. And when these young gentlemen of England have gone through their preliminary studies, and have attained a certain age, then, in order to Spaniardise them completely—*pour achever des les Espagnoliser*—they are transported from the Netherlands into Spain, where there are other colleges for them, and there they are instructed in philosophy and theology, and confirmed in the said belief and holy faith, namely, that the kingdom of England belonged to the late King of Spain, Philip II., and now belongs to his children. And after these young gentlemen of England have thus completed their course of studies, those among them who are considered most Spaniardised, most courageous, and most confirmed in the Spanish *Credo*, are sent into England to sow that faith, and win over to it those who have not left the country, and to act as spies, and inform the Spaniards of what is going on in England, and what they think might

and ought to be done in order to reduce England under the dominion of Spain, and in order, should it be necessary, to endure martyrdom as well, or, *rather*, more for the said *Spanish faith* than for the *Catholic religion*.¹ The Spanish troops formerly, and very lately, sent into Ireland are also for the same purpose, to seize in the interim all they can of the queen's dominions, and thus to serve as a stepping stone some day for the invasion of England." After alluding to the foreign resistance foreseen as inevitable to this scheme of the Spanish

¹ Mr. Borrow, of the Bible in Spain, visited one of these colleges, at Valladolid. His observations will be found as inconsistent as they are false (in the most important points), according to all that we have hitherto read, and the present testimony (acknowledged to be most respectable) of Cardinal D'Ossat. Still there is something so racy in the man's originality, that I am anxious to state my motive in transfixing the sentiments which I have before quoted from his curious and most entertaining pilgrimage. Therefore, let me rather be understood to vituperate the method of those who seem to imagine that they can defend the Church of England, by means similar to those which the Jesuits and all propagandists employed and employ, to undermine our hearty Protestantism. Such means, it is clear, will never answer, in the long run. Let each man—I mean each Protestant—ask himself what *is* the Church of England—I mean what *constitutes* the Church of England essentially? The question will lead him into an intricate investigation; but if he pursue it heartily, he will be able to discover that we have not as yet established amongst us that upright, consistent, God-beloved design which the sacred name of *Protestant* is worthy to christen. Here is Mr. Borrow's account of one of the colleges alluded to so plainly, so strikingly, so politically, by Cardinal D'Ossat. "Of all the curiosities of this college, the most remarkable is the picture-gallery, which contains neither more nor less than the portraits of a variety of scholars of this house who eventually suffered martyrdom in England, in the exercise of their vocation in the angry times of the *Sixth Edward* (!) and *fierce Elizabeth*. Yes, in this very house were many of those pale, smiling, half-foreign priests educated, who, like stealthy grimalkins, traversed green England in all directions; crept into old halls beneath umbrageous rookeries, fanning the dying embers of popery, with no other hope, nor perhaps wish, than to perish disembowelled by the bloody hands of the executioner, amongst the yells of a rabble as bigoted as themselves: priests like Bedingfield and Garnet, and many others who have left a name in English story. Doubtless many a history, only the more wonderful for being true, could be wrought out of the archives of the English popish seminary at Valladolid."—*Bible in Spain*, c. xxi.

succession, the cardinal proceeds to say, that “The pope foresees and believes in this resistance which will be made to the King of Spain and his sister ; and has imagined in his mind that he might succeed in making the Duke of Parma, or his brother, the Cardinal Farnese, King of England after the death of the queen. [The reader remembers that this was the suggestion of the Jesuit Parsons]. Your Majesty will easily believe that he wishes them to attain this dignity on account of the alliance which connects them to his Holiness, and, moreover, because they are devoted Catholics, and accounted good and moderate princes, and his Holiness would think he was doing a deed agreeable to God, and profitable to the Catholic religion Moreover, his Holiness intends to aid these two princes with all his forces, both temporal and spiritual, and with all the authority which he has over the Catholic princes, lords, cities and nations. About four years ago, his Holiness created in England a certain *arch-priest*, in order that all the ecclesiastics and all the Catholics of the kingdom might have some authority, to whom they might have recourse in the affairs of the Catholic religion, so as to unite them among themselves, and suggest to them the best method for their preservation, and for the re-establishment of the Catholic religion. His Holiness has been persuaded to believe that by this means he will be able to effectuate a great part of what he will desire. And I know it is said that his Holiness has lately sent to his nuncio in the Netherlands, three breves, which he is to keep until he knows that the queen is dead, and then he is to send them into England—one to the ecclesiastics, the second to the nobility, and the third to the people. By these breves the three sections of the English nation are admonished

and exhorted by his Holiness to remain united among themselves, so as to receive a Catholic king whom his Holiness shall name, such as shall seem agreeable, profitable, and honourable, and all for the honour and glory of God, and for the restoration of the Catholic religion, and for the salvation of their souls.”¹ Thus did Father Parsons originate a scheme for the disposal of the crowns of England and Scotland. None but those whose infatuation made them unreasonable, looked upon the project without ridiculing its wild absurdity. Pasquin, the Roman Punch, said :—“ If any man will buy the kingdom of England, let him repair to a merchant, with a black square cap, in the city, and he shall have a very good pennyworth of it.”² Thus spake Pasquin to Morfio : but Pope Clement had said to the cardinal :—“ Neither you nor I are so old, but that we may yet behold Elizabeth subdued. England has been conquered often, and may be conquered again.” He called the queen “ an old woman without a husband, and without a certain successor.”³ Henry IV. treated the project as a chimæra, as based on the hopes held out by the exiles, who promised more than they could perform—feeble instruments, doubtful friends, and dangerous advisers.⁴ Nevertheless the Spaniards prosecuted the Jesuit-scheme with their usual infatuation. They retained spies in France, in England, and Scotland, who pretended to be dissatisfied with the Spaniards, but served them devotedly, especially by forwarding the correspondence to and from England ; and some of these spies were men of worthless, desperate characters. With one of them

¹ Lettres du Card. D'Ossat, v. 55.

² Butler, Mem. ii. 51.

³ D'Ossat, ii. 434—6.

⁴ Lettres du Card. D'Ossat, v. Supplem. p. 52 ; Butler, *ubi suprà*.

Parsons corresponded : their hiding-places were Paris and the principal seaports of France.¹

Vain was the machination. The scheme fell to the ground—to nothing—a frivolous, ridiculous concoction which was doubtless never seriously entertained by Parsons himself. Doubtless his systematic exposition of the Spanish pretensions was intended to cover the invasion of England—in nothing but the arbitrament of arms did Parsons confide. Repeated disappointment blasted that hope under Elizabeth : but he counted on a disputed succession after her death. “It had been expected,” says Butler, “that many competitors to the throne would arise ; and particularly it had been supposed, that the party which had been principally instrumental in bringing Mary to the scaffold, would not quietly permit her son to ascend the throne. Those, it was thought, looked towards Arabella ; and, being a Catholic, her claims, it was imagined, would naturally be favoured by that party. These constituted, at the time, the most numerous portion of the subjects of the realm. They considered themselves, therefore, entitled to a vote at the election, and the pope, seconding their views, claimed all their votes and interest for Arabella.”² Thus it appears, by this admission, that the Jesuit-

¹ D'Ossat, v. 69, *et seq.* Butler's analysis of the whole affair, as stated by the cardinal, by no means conveys an adequate idea of the scheme in all its bearings. His partiality for the Jesuits is as evident in the analysis as it is in his brief account of the Company, with which he dexterously prefaces their advent to England. It is a transparent apology, with not a few glaring mis-statements. It is only charitable to believe that he never read the histories and other works of the Jesuits themselves—and this remark may be applied to most of their apologists who “deny everything”—the dealers in wholesale negation and retail laudation.

² Mem. ii. p. 54. This poor lady was cousin to James I. She died in prison, and insane, (1615), after enduring much cruelty from her heartless relative. See D'Israeli, *Curiosities*, i. 256, *et seq.* Ling. viii., ix.

faction were “principally instrumental in bringing Mary to the scaffold,” though Elizabeth and her ministers are made to bear the blame in Catholic declamations, more or less echoed by certain Protestant writers. And this faction, who had the blood of the Queen of Scots on their heads, were retained by the pope, to promote the scheme which was to exclude the son of the queen, martyred by the same Jesuit-faction ! Surely this lawyer did not reflect on the evident consequences to be drawn from these admissions of a most notorious fact—which, however, when broadly asserted, is fiercely “denied.” One of the pope’s breves to the Catholics of England was sent to the Jesuit Garnet, provincial of England, and the salient point of the precious document was a command, enjoining the Catholics “not to admit any person, how near soever upon the line to the throne, after the queen’s death, unless such person would not only tolerate the Catholic religion, but promote it to the utmost of his power ; and engage himself by oath, according to the custom of his ancestors, for that purpose.”¹ These qualifications of course could not be

¹ Butler, ii. 55. Butler very slyly appends a note, stating that he “has not discovered these breves in any *Bullarium* ;” but Mr. Tierney has published one of them, addressed to the Nuncio in Flanders—and the identical passage, objected to Garnet on his subsequent trial for the Gunpowder Plot affair, occurs in this copy, only in somewhat stronger terms than those alleged by Sir Edward Coke—“ne cuiquam, in re tanti momenti jus sibi quovis modo assumenti, faveant ; ne sua studia ac suffragia in quemvis conferant, nisi, ante omnia et super omnia, conservationi, stabilitati, et libertati Catholicæ fidei cautum sit in eo regno, isque rex fiat qui in gremio ecclesiæ Catholicæ fidei (cujus caput est hæc sancta Romana ecclesia, omnium ecclesiarum mater et magistra) se vitam victurum sanctè polliceatur, et firmiter caveat, et inviolatè observet, et denique, cum cæteris Catholicis regibus, nobis et successoribus nostris, veram obedientiam præstet.”—*Tierney’s Dodd*, iii. *Append.* xiv. Both Butler and Mr. Tierney state that there were only *two* breves issued by the pope ; but it is curious to find that the original assertion of the accurate D’Ossat is proved by Parsons himself, and in a document published by Mr. Tierney himself—to which I am about to

found in any pretender but the one suggested by the Jesuit Parsons, and upheld by the pope—namely, the Farnese as a husband for Arabella. Parsons wrote “instructions” for the nuncio in Flanders, in which he distinctly states that the creation of the archpriest in England was intended to give unity to the scheme—just as Cardinal D’Ossat declared to Henry IV. “But if,” he continues, “any should be found (which is not expected) disturbing this peace and union, or disobeying the words, advice, and commands of their superiors, [the Spanish Jesuit-faction,] or should wish to follow their own judgment to the offence of others and the disunion of the Catholics, your Excellency will, by all means, strenuously take care to influence and bring them back—but will coerce those who resist or continue stubborn, by the infliction of censures and ecclesiastical discipline.”¹ It is thus evident that Parsons did all he could in preparing the grand event—“whilst the death of the queen was looked for”—*dum reginæ obitus expectatur*.² “That Parsons and the other individuals

refer. It is amongst the MSS. at Stonyhurst, in Parsons’s own handwriting, and is entitled “Instructiones quædam ad ea melius exequenda, quæ *tribus* brevibus . . . continentur,” iii. *Append.* xiv.

¹ “Si qui verò invenirentur (quod non speratur) qui pacem hanc et unionem perturbarent, vel superiorum dictis aut monitis vel etiam præceptis non obedirent, vel suum judicium ad aliorum offensionem et Catholicorum divisionem sequi vellent, hos dominatio vestra modis omnibus juvandos ac reducendos pro suo virili curabit; reluctantes verò aut pertinaces censuris etiam ac disciplinâ ecclesiasticâ coercebit.”—*Instructiones, &c., MS. apud Tierney*, iii. *Append.* xiv. § 5.

² *Ibid.* § 3. Doubtless the reader has been struck with this confident expectation of the queen’s death, so general at a time when she was in good health. It was somewhat indecent and unchristian; but perhaps some vigorous *Novenas* were going on amongst the Jesuit-novices, so murderous in their piety, as we have seen before, in the case of Pope Sixtus V. It is to be hoped that none of Mariana’s suggestions touching secret poison of mortal power, were “tried” on the queen. Particularly as it now appears that the “true relation of what succeeded in the sickness and death of Queen Elizabeth,” quoted in snatches by

belonging to his party," says Mr. Tierney, "had seriously determined, if possible, to set aside the Scottish succession, in favour of a Catholic sovereign, the preceding documents abundantly testify ; but I notice it, because

Lingard, is endorsed by the Jesuit Parsons as the "relation of the *Lady Southwell*," whilst Mr. Tierney says that "the person called 'Lady' Southwell, was one of Elizabeth's *maids of honour*," iii. p. 70. Thus it appears that the paper was sanctioned by Parsons. Now this "lady" states as follows : "Her majesty being in very good health, one day Sir John Stanhope, being the vice-chamberlain, and secretary *Cecil's* dependant and familiar, came and presented her majesty with a piece of gold of the bigness of an angel, full of characters, which, he said, an old woman in Wales bequeathed her on her death-bed ; and thereupon he discoursed how the said old woman, by virtue of the same, lived to the age of one hundred and twenty years ; and in that age, having all her body withered and consumed, and wanting nature to nourish, she died, commanding the said piece of gold to be carefully sent to her majesty ; alleging further, that as long as the said old woman wore it upon her body, she could not die. The queen, upon the confidence she had hereof, took the said gold, and wore it about her neck. Now she fell not suddenly sick, yet daily decreased of her rest and feeding ; and, within fifteen days, fell downright sick ; and the cause being wondered at by my Lady Serope, with whom she was very private and confident, being her near kinswoman, her majesty told her (commanding her to conceal the same), that she saw, one night, in her bed, her body exceeding lean, and fearful, in a light of fire. Afterwards, in the melancholy of her sickness, she desired to see a true looking-glass, which, in twenty years before, she had not seen, but only such a one which of purpose was made to deceive her sight ; which glass being brought her, she fell presently exclaiming at all those which had so much commended her, and took it so offensively, that all those, which had before flattered her, durst not come in her sight. Now falling into extremity, she sat two days and three nights upon her stool, ready dressed, and could never be brought by any of her council to go to bed, or eat, or drink ; only my lord admiral one time persuaded her to drink some broth. For any of the rest, she would not answer them to any question ; but said softly to my lord admiral's earnest persuasions, that if he knew what she had seen in her bed, he would not persuade her as he did. And secretary *Cecil*, overhearing her, asked if her majesty had seen any spirits ; to which she said she scorned to answer him to so idle a question . . . And presently commanding him and the rest to depart her chamber, she willed my lord admiral to stay : to whom she shook her head, and with a pitiful voice, said, ' My lord, I am tied with a chain of iron round my neck.' He alleging her wanted courage to her, she replied, ' I am tied, and the case is altered with me.' Then two ladies, waiting on her in her chamber, discovered, in the bottom of her chair, the *queen of hearts*, with a nail of iron knocked through the forehead of it ; the which the ladies durst not pull out, remembering that the like thing was used to the old lady of Sussex, and proved afterwards for a witchcraft, for the which certain were hanged, as

Parsons afterwards endeavoured to persuade James that the publication of 'Doleman's' treatise, and the other steps taken by the Spanish party, were never intended to produce any real effect on the succession; that

instruments of the same. The Lady Elizabeth Guilford, then waiting on the queen, and leaving her asleep in her privy chamber, met her, as she thought, three or four chambers off, and, fearing she would have been displeased that she left her alone, came towards her, to excuse herself; and *she vanished away*; and when she returned into the same chamber where she had left her, *found her asleep as before*. So growing past recovery (having kept her bed fifteen days, besides three days she sat upon her stool, and one day, when being pulled up by force, she stood on her feet fifteen hours), the council sent to her the Bishop of Canterbury and other of the prelates, upon sight of whom she was much offended, cholerically rating them, bidding them be packing, saying she was no atheist, but knew full well that they were hedge priests, and took it for an indignity that they should speak to her." Then follow the importunate questions put to her about the succession—"when they named my Lord Beauchamp; whereto she said, 'I will have no rascal's son in my seat, but one worthy to be a king. Hereupon, instantly she died.'"—*Tierney*, iii. p. 70. Such is the awfully absurd account circulated among the Catholics, with the sanction of the Jesuit Parsons, who probably "had a finger in it." At the commencement the suspicion of poison is almost a conviction—*nor would I affirm that Elizabeth was not poisoned*. The conclusion is of a piece with those hideously disgusting legends of Romanism and Jesuitism, concocted to glut the religious rancour of their devotees. Surely Mr. Tierney published the document in order to show forth still more strikingly, as he invariably does, the infernal mind of the Jesuit Parsons and his faction. If you read Camden's account of the queen's death, you will see how her indignation is, in this beggarly account, transformed into weakness and vile superstition—the unavoidable hobgoblins of Jesuit-Romanism. Will you believe that Lingard actually pretends to make a mystery of the queen's indignant exclamation at the disgraceful conduct of many around her, when she said: "They have yoked my neck; I have none whom I can trust; my condition is strangely turned upside down." He pretends that Camden did not understand the allusion! . . . He says that the "MS. is endorsed, Apr. 1, 1607," but takes good care not to say "by *Parsons*." And, as touching the possibility at least of poison having been given to her majesty, I may mention that "*the possibility of a secret negotiation with Cecil*" was one of the proposals made to the King of Spain in 1597, according to Mr. Tierney, iii. Append. p. lxxvii; and we see by this narrative that a dependant of Cecil was the person who presented the "piece of gold," &c.; and the writer gives the results as though *she* thought there was "something in it." In his report of April 1, 1603, Beaumont, the French ambassador, states: "Many say that *Cecil* is the cause of the queen's death, inasmuch as she was once angry with him. He has certainly connections with James of Scotland and his queen, who exercises great influence."—*Raumer, Hist. of the 16th and 17th Cent.* ii. 189.

they were employed merely as feints, for the purpose of driving him to seek a reconciliation with the Church ; and that, notwithstanding any outward demonstrations to the contrary, the whole party had always secretly resolved to receive him as the undoubted heir to the throne"!¹

In effect, the result of all the machinations devised by Parsons is a striking moral. Sophism, treasonable tamperings, inexhaustible falsehood—the scheme of an archpriest, and the consequent tyranny—all availed

nothing in the infamous cause : never did king
JAMES I. 1603. succeed to the throne more easily than James,

the son of Mary Queen of Scots. A few hours after the peaceful and quiet death of Queen Elizabeth, James “was proclaimed king with the joyful shouts and acclamations of all the people.”² Can any argument more triumphantly prove that the Spanish Jesuit faction in England formed but a despicable minority of traitors? Is it not evident that the Jesuits must have deceived their royal and pontifical patrons as to the real state of matters in England touching the succession? This must be admitted in order to account for the result, after the imposing measures so strenuously applied by the pope to insure a Catholic succession. But the object of Parsons was to *arouse* an opposition to James—nothing less than a civil war in England, when the Spanish and papal forces might appear on the scene, to decide the question, and effectuate the absurd and senseless sophisms of his beggarly treatise. The pride of his bad heart could not be humbled to submit to his repeated failures, and he scrupled not to peril humanity in pursuit of his phantom : for it is evident, from his words, quoted in a

¹ Tierney, iii. Append. p. lxxii.

² Camden, *in fine*.

previous page, that he expected an outbreak at the death of Elizabeth. Thus did he speculate on human misery : safe himself, he would recklessly imperil all with whom he was connected by the ties of his religion. There are minds which nevertheless admire the Jesuit Parsons—admire him for his craft and dexterity in “coping” with Elizabeth and her ministers. But what are the *facts*, as we have witnessed ? Why, that he was, after all, but a bungling aggressor—constantly detected—everlastingly baffled—beaten on his own ground ! Had he headed a “stir,” and perished on the scaffold, there might be some little reason to respect the man :—but a cowardly, skulking, false-hearted intriguer,—seeking safety for himself, whilst he roused all others to their destruction—such a man deserves the fullest measure of scorn that all mankind can pour on him as a disgrace, a shame to humanity.

But Robert Parsons did not “give it up,” as yet :—he would not be exhausted. James was king in spite of “Doleman,”—and “the Man of Sorrows,” set his wits to work, to achieve a deliverance from his desperate affliction. Unquestionably he concocted a new scheme as soon as ever he bitterly heard of the “joyful shouts and acclamations,” which hailed the heretic Scotchman to the throne which he destined for the gentle Arabella and the orthodox Farnese. The scheme began immediately after the news of James’s accession reached the Jesuit. Exactly two months after that event, he penned the following letter to a party in the English court, with the view of its being shown to the vain pedant royal—and, as will be evident, cleverly concocted so as to mystify the Scotchman, and throw him off his guard. With all the information which we now possess, respecting this

Jesuit's machinations in furtherance of the views of his "Doleman," this letter will, I think, be a full-length portrait of Father Robert Parsons, drawn by himself. I have transcribed it from the original manuscript¹—a perfect model of close, compact, deliberate penmanship, wonderfully illustrative of his unfeeling, false, and crafty soul.

"TO THE RIGHT WORSHIPFUL MY VERY GOOD FREND,

"Mr. M. T., geve these.

"My loving good Sir, if my former letters have come there to our Frendes Hands, written since your last great change, you will have seene how your affaires are taken here, to witt, with great contentment of all sortes of men, upon hope that our new king will, in time, suffer himself to be rightly informed in Religion; which point you knowe is the Thing that hath held men in suspence these many yeres; who otherwise have loved his Majestie with all their affection; and now, seeing that God hath placed him so strangely and sodainly in the throne, with so general applause and consent of all as hardly in so great a matter could be expected, We attribute all to his divine providence for the best, hoping that he will also in tyme add that which wanteth for the complete joy of our hartes; and in the meane space, we doe here the best offices we can for his Majesties service, and so shall contynue by God's grace, and already I have appointed both in this and all other seminaries, that contynuall prayer be made, with divers fastings and other devotions, for the good and prosperous success of his Majesties affaires. And, whereas, the last week I received a certaine booke of his Majestie, intituled Βασιλικον δωρον (which indeede is a princely gift and a princely work and talked of many times here before, now that I had it of our London printe of this yeare 1603). The reading of this booke hath exceedingly comforted me, as I have imparted also the same comfort to the other principal men of this place, and namely yesterday to his Holiness who, I assure you, scarce holds teares for comfort, to heare certaine passages in favour of vertue and hatred to vice, which I related to him out of that booke; and in very truth, sir, I do highly admire many things in that booke, and could never have imagined that which I see therein. Christ

¹ MS. Bibl. Cotton. Jul. F. vi. 142.

Jhesus make him a Catholique, for hee would be a mirror of all princes of Christendome; and this for the common [? weal]. Now somewhat about myself. I doe hear divers waies of sondry attempts in hand and to be taken in hand to hold me in disgrace with his Majestie; and in this I am told, will concur not only Protestants and puritans, but divers also of our discontented priests joyned with some Scottish-men, both here and elsewhere; every one having his different motives, humours, and ends therein; and I for my part, though I thank God I am little troubled with such treatments, having set up my rest to doe that which is—*rectum in oculis Domini* [right in the eyes of the Lord], as near as I may, and to desire or expect little of this world for the few yeares I have to live, yet doe I think myself bound notwithstanding, as well for others as for myself, to use the best diligence I can, to give satisfaction,—especially to so just and so good meaning a prince as our new king by his booke sheweth himself to be; for if you reade the 99th page thereof, you shall see so excellent notes given for avoiding and shifting of calumniators, as may encourage any man to treat any honest cause confidently with such a prince. Wherefore I shall desire you hartely to procure some man (not ungrateful to his Majestie) to deale with Him for me as soon as may bee; two letters of mine alreadie I think his Majestie hath seene, written about this matter, whilst the Queene lived, the one some years gone, to the Earle of Angus, the copie whereof was intercepted in England; and the other last yeare, written to his Majestie, and sent by Sir James Linsay. My defence in those matters consisteth of two points:—First my faithfull and continuall travailes for his Majestie's mother, and for her and his [safety] during her life, and for many yeares after, wherein I may say truly that not only—*plus omnibus laboravi* [I have laboured [more than all] of any one that laboured in those daies, with foraine princes for their Majesties service, but—*plus omnibus profeci* also [I have effected more], as may appear by the sums of money and other presents, which I procured both from the King of Spaine and Pope Gregorie 13, towards the maintenance of a garde for safety of His Majesties person in Scotland, and to other uses; and if his Majestie either had not the use of those sommes, or remember them not, in respect of his small age and many troubles in those dayes, yet is the thing sure, and I can easely get autenticall testimonies thereof, if His Majestie require it. The second point is about some latter proceedings, and the Booke of Succession by name, whereunto I answer most sincerely, that as it appeareth by our late Cardinall's handwriting that he together with Sir Fran. Inglefielde and

some others were the chief authors of that book, so whatsoever consent I or other Catholics of our nation had therein, it was for noe aversion of minds or of good wills from his Majestie, for whom *he (sic)* had laboured so earnestly and so many yeares before, but only that by laying forth other competitors besides himself he might be drawne that soon to be a catholicke,—the only want thereof was our affection ; and this is sincerely the truth, and nothing ells ;—and seeing that this hath not hindered his Majestie any thing at all (!) and that I can (I hope) recompence this fault abundantly in other services hereafter which may fall out, as all readie I have begun in some matters of moment (whereof His Majestie may chance hear somewhat ere long) I trust that the partie which shall deale with His Majestie for me herein, shall easely obtain my desire, which is only to enjoy his Majesties good opinion, for his better service hereafter ; and that he will not believe calumniators against me, without trying first the truth ; and this being once obtained, if it shall please his Majestie to geve me leave any further to write unto him, I shall do as you from thence shall advertise me of his Highnes pleasure ; and so praying you be carefull to doe somewhat in this pointe and to advertize me thereof, I bidd you hartily farewell.”

This 24th of May, *1613.

*1603.

R. PARSONS.”¹

The post-dating of this letter, and the curious method he adopts by way of correction, is somewhat remarkable.

¹ Mr. Tierney seems not to be aware of the existence of this original letter, in the library of the British Museum, and has been (unintentionally, doubtless) deceived by Mr. Oliver in misrepresenting the said letter—for it is evidently that only one letter is in view, both from the words quoted, and the identical date (as corrected), namely, May 24th, 1603. Oliver is, I hope, only mistaken when he says that it was addressed to *Garnet*. The statements made by Parsons at the beginning of the letter—indeed, throughout the document—would have been perfectly superfluous if addressed to Garnet, even supposing the initials and “right worshipful M. T.” a feint. Mr. Tierney quotes the “copy” of it, which Mr. Oliver sent to him, without stating whence he got it—which was a pity : he alludes to it when proving that Parsons was the author of the “Book of Succession,” and his words are much to the point : “A copy of the letter cited by Mr. Oliver [*Collect. Persons*], the original of which is, I believe, at Stonyhurst, has been kindly forwarded to me by that gentleman. It is dated May 24, 1603, and is addressed to Garnet for the express purpose of engaging him ‘to procure some man not ungrateful to his majesty, to deal’ with the king in behalf of the

I must state that both the *antedate* and the *date* are in his own handwriting:—it was one of the

writer. Referring to some previous letters, it restates the grounds of his defence against the charges of his adversaries; speaks of his services both to James and to the Queen of Scots; and then proceeds to the particular accusation which had connected his name with the authorship of 'Doleman.' 'I answer,' he says, 'most sincerely, that, as it appeareth by our late cardinal's handwriting, that he, together with Sir Francis Englefield and some others, were the chief authors of that book, so, whatever consent either I or other Catholics of our nation had therein, it was of no aversion of minds or good-wills from his majesty, for whom *we* [in the original, *he*] had laboured so earnestly, so many years before, but only that, by laying forth other competitors besides himself, he might be drawn sooner [in original, 'that soon'] to be a Catholic.' Now, first, it will be remarked that the only two persons whom he ventures to name, were both dead at the period when he wrote; that the 'others' of whom he speaks, are mentioned only generally; and that, although he evidently wishes James to believe that he merely *consented* to the publication, there is even here no real denial of his having been at least *among* the active co-operators in the work. In the next place, Allen died in 1594, Englefield only two years later:—if the former had written the avowal here described, why was it never mentioned before? Why are we not even now told to whom it was addressed? Above all, how comes it that Parsons, who was repeatedly assailed as the author of the book—who, in his publications and letters, was continually endeavouring to remove the suspicion—and who, in his letter to the Earl of Angus, in January, 1600, had actually told the same story of 'Allen, Englefield, and others' (Plowden, 356), never until this moment thought of alleging the 'cardinal's handwriting' in support of his assertion? Again, the letter tells Garnet [M. T.] that the book in question had been written '*only* that, by laying forth other competitors besides himself,' the king 'might be drawn the sooner to be a Catholic.' But, on another occasion, Parsons could assign a very different origin to the work. In a paper drawn up, in April, 1597, for the express purpose of showing that the right of James to the succession had not been more impugned by the author than that of any other of the claimants, he undertakes to set forth the several reasons for which the book had been composed—*las razones por las quales se escrivió*. The first was to obviate the inconveniences of the law, by which the people were forbidden to discuss the question of the succession; the second, to expose the falsehood of the doctrine which asserted that propinquity of blood, not orthodoxy in religion, formed the real title to the throne; the third, to prepare the Catholics to act with promptitude and decision, when the death of the queen should render it necessary to appoint a successor; the fourth and last, to give to foreign princes, and especially to the pope, an opportunity of weighing the pretensions of the several competitors, and of taking such steps as prudence or necessity might require. (Parsons's original MS. in my possession: there is a copy at Stonyhurst, MSS. Ang. A. ii. 26). The reader will see that the '*only*' reason for which Parsons would persuade James that the obnoxious treatise was published, is not even alluded to in this paper: and he will scarcely, therefore,

methods used for the purpose of mystification.¹ This move of Parsons seems to have been suggested by a letter which he received from Garnet, dated 16th of April, informing him of the perfect acquiescence of all parties in the king's accession. Complete toleration was confidently expected for all religions: "so that, if no foreign competitors hinder, the Catholics think themselves well, and *would be loath any Catholic princes, or his holiness should stir against the peaceable possession of the kingdom.*"² All were endeavouring "to work a good conceit in the king and the lords, of themselves"—and even the Jesuits wrote "a common letter, to be shewed, as written to a gentleman of account [probably the "right worshipfull M. T."], wherein they yielded reasons why they were to be trusted and esteemed, as well as others."³

be surprised, if, with this and other similar contradictions before me, I unhesitatingly reject the authority of the declaration to Garnet" [M. T.] This is a specimen of Mr. Tierney's method of convicting Parsons on almost every occasion where the Jesuit plays his part—with his "lies positive" and his "lies privative," to use the Jesuit's own expression. Nevertheless, Mr. Tierney is an orthodox Catholic clergyman. Indeed, a man must be bereft of all moral feeling, or the greater part of it must be merged in partyism, in order to approve of the life and deeds of Father Robert Parsons, Jesuit and everything else as the occasion suited. See Tierney, iii. 31, note, proving Parsons to be the author of the "Book of Succession."

¹ Mr. Tierney gives a specimen of the method respecting an important letter written by Garnet, about the time of the Gunpowder Plot. Mr. Tierney's remark is as follows: "Endorsed by Parsons originally thus:—'P. Garnet, 21st October, 1605, of the Persecution:' *with the same ink, however, he has subsequently drawn his pen through the '21,' and above it written '4°'* In another copy of the paper also, where it appears most likely to catch the eye, he has inscribed the same date, thus—'4° 8 bris.'"—Tierney, iv. Append. 107. The italics are Mr. Tierney's.

² MS. apud Tierney, iv. Append. vii.

³ Ibid. Garnet promised Parsons a sight of the apologetic document, and also to inform him of its "effect." Mr. Tierney gives an analysis of it, and concludes thus:—"The reader will hardly be surprised to learn that Garnet, who, I believe, was the author of this paper, and who must have known the falsehood of one, at least, of its declarations, never had to inform its correspondent of its 'effect.'"—Tierney, *ubi supra*.

But vain was the hope that either Parsons or Garnet, or the Catholics, placed in the son of Mary, Queen of Scots, who seems to have been, throughout his life, either frightened by his shadow or his wits, so prodigious. And yet it was a fine opportunity for a king to display his beneficent intellect to mankind—through gratitude, if by no other motive. The tears which all “true Englishmen” shed for the death of Queen Elizabeth, were soon wiped off, by the accession of King James. The ancient feuds between the nations of England and Scotland were reconciled. Day by day, from Berwick to London, a most magnificent and joyous reception greeted the Scot, who had been all his life a pensioner, supported by the voluntary contributions of Spain, Rome, and England—each having especial motives for its “charity.” And now he was careering to the golden throne of England—utterly oblivious of his past trials, difficulties, and pinching want. In his progress, and at Newark, being told that some one, “in want of money,” doubtless, had “cut a purse,” James signed a warrant to hang him forthwith—without the slightest fellow-feeling for the brother who had “fallen on evil days.” Never a whit, however, was the jollity of the English people checked by this “prelusive drop” of the Scot’s grim despotism. The nearer he came to London the greater was the concourse, the greater were the acclamations of the people—although this king, so prodigal in proclamations, had issued one prohibiting the loyal rush of his “loving people,” because, said he, “it raised so much dust as proved troublesome in his passage.” On reaching London, his first care, (“being a prince, above all others, passionately addicted to hunting”) was to issue another proclamation forbidding all manner of persons to kill

deer, and all kinds of wild-fowl used for hunting and hawking—upon pain of the several laws and penalties to be executed upon them.¹ Such was the Scotchman's gratitude to the people "not one of whom had lifted up his hand against him, at his coming in,"—his own royal words. Was it therefore to be expected that he would fulfil the hopes of the wretched Catholics—merely because the leaders of their factions had—when it seemed a good speculation—lavished pensions and laudation on the vain and prodigal monarch? It is hard to find gratitude evinced for the purest, the most disinterested benefactions: but undoubtedly it is not to be wondered at, if we fail to get even the pharisee's reward for the calculated bribes of selfishness. A single month had scarcely elapsed after the king's arrival in London, when the Catholics were painfully convinced that, if James was not a stork, he was certainly not likely to be a log, for their leaders to do as they liked withal:—in six months their fondest hopes and expectations were dissipated, sunk in the gulph of disappointment. Over his cups the king called the pope "the true Antichrist."² This is only the Greek for an opponent of Christ, and might be applicable to all who do not live as Christians ought to live: but we have concocted the word into a veritable personage, as yet to arouse such a persecution of the faithful as this world hath never seen or felt—a sort of terrible monster who, to believe the "commentators," will defy the Almighty himself—in short so horrible a monster that this world, wicked as it is,

¹ Coke, i. 7. "The people of London," says Beaumont, "appear strangely barbarous and ungrateful to the memory of Elizabeth, in that, after such long standing, almost idolatrous worship, they lighted, on the day of her decease, bonfires in honour of her successor:" *Raumer*, ii. 193, but a few weeks were enough to punish them for allowing themselves to disgrace their queen.

² Jardine, ii. 21.

will be polluted by his touch—and therefore shall be forthwith shivered into nought. Somewhat like that was James's opinion when he called the pope Antichrist—simply because, like ourselves, he really knew nothing about the recondite mystery, which had better be let alone by honest Christians. But the poor Catholics shuddered at the awful dictum of the Scoto-British Solomon, and looked to windward for squalls accordingly. One of their priests, Watson by name—he whom you have heard denouncing Parsons and the Jesuits—was most disgracefully treated by James, though Watson had been his “friend in need:”—the king told him insultingly—but with perfect truth—that “the papists were no longer necessary to his *advancement* ;” and Coke, the attorney-general, publicly declared, on the king's authority, that “the eyes of the Catholics should sooner fall out than they should ever see a toleration.” This was in 1603. In the following year the king came nearer to the point—being pushed by an “extremity,” which will be presently declared. He said he had, in consideration of the loyalty displayed at his accession, mitigated the fines for recusancy. An obscure and inexplicable plot of a few priests had been discovered ; and now, after giving the Catholics “a year of probation,” as he called it, “to conform themselves ;” but seeing “it had not wrought that effect, he had fortified all the laws that were against them, and commanded they should be put in execution to the uttermost.” The Catholic missionaries were banished—in fact, all the laws of Elizabeth against Jesuits and priests, were to be executed with rigour. The usual fine of 20*l.* per month for recusancy was demanded—nay, the demand was extended to the whole

period since the arrival of James, during which the penalties had for the most part ceased to be exacted. Ye who so bitterly denounce the pealing income-tax, think of this "religious" income-fleeing, and be consoled with your remnants on 'Change. Still, feel for the wretched Catholics of those times. Numerous families of moderate incomes were suddenly reduced to a state of beggary. Others, with larger property, became involved in difficulties, such as those in which we swim and swim, as it were, 'mid splinters of wrecks, that wound us on all sides, when, if we ask ourselves why we struggle on, instead of willingly sinking at once, it requires a strong heart to reply with "Cheer up—better days will come." In most instances, all the goods and two-thirds of the real estate of the unfortunate sufferers were surrendered, for the purpose of satisfying the iniquitous enactment "passed" by the parliament in the reign of Elizabeth, and now enforced with ravenous demand. And why? 'Tis bitterly ridiculous; but James had brought with him from Scotland a number of *needy followers*. They had spent their small substance in riotous extravagance on the king's arrival in England. They had now to repair their broken fortunes. The dream of Pharaoh was to be realised: the riches of the land were to be devoured by the hungry dependents of the new Egyptian, who had dreamt his dream. The Scotch asked for everything: nothing was denied them: they devoured the kingdom like locusts. "The setting up of these golden calves cost more than all the wars of Elizabeth." In the establishment of Prince Henry alone, there were 297 persons receiving salaries.¹ He had not wherewithal to satisfy

¹ Raumer, Polit. Hist. i. 421, and note.

their cravings, for his abuse of his good fortune soon made him poor, where he might have had abundance that fails not, and his men were clamorous. What was to be done? A method was soon devised. Each of these sycophants was ordered to search out as many Catholics as possible, and to select from the more opulent those who were most likely to answer his purpose. Then the king in his bounty "bestowed" these persons upon his minion. He made over to him whatever claims the crown possessed, or might afterwards possess, on them, for the fines of recusancy—authorising him either to proceed at law for the recovery of the penalties, or to accept a grant of money, by way of composition for the amount.¹ Here was a frightful state of affairs! Here was a Solomon to inveigh against the Catholic clergy, and declare that, "as long as they continue to maintain their most obnoxious doctrines, they are in no way sufferable to live in the kingdom."² What a vile speculation—a worse than pagan persecution—since it made "religion" the pretext for the most iniquitous extortion. Nor was this all. An act of parliament went forth, classing Catholics with forgers, perjurers, and outlaws, and disabling them from sitting in the House,—injury aggravated by insult. Another act soon followed, declaring that all persons who had been educated in Catholic seminaries abroad, should be incapable of taking or holding any lands or goods within the king's dominions

¹ Tierney, iv. 38, note; Jardine, ii. 23. On the authority of Beaumont, the French ambassador, in his dispatch to Villeroi, dated 1st June, 1605. "Enfin il a été resolu au conseil de ce prince que les Catholiques payeront le tribut ordinaire, tant du passé qui ne leur a point esté exigé, que du present; et sur cela leurs biens sont departis et assignés en don à des particuliers courtisans, avec lesquels ils sont contrainsts de composer; dont ils sont au desespoir."

² Commons' Journals, i.; Jardine, ii. 22.

—another glorious speculation in *behalf* of religion, and in whole for the pockets of the king and his “lean and ill-favoured kine” from the land of starvation. Every Catholic who kept a schoolmaster in his house, who did not go to church, or was not licensed by the bishop of the diocese, had to pay forty shillings for every day they retained the said master; and he himself had to pay the same penalty. It was a fine of 100*l.* for a Catholic to send his children to be educated abroad.¹ Was there no voice raised against this maddening tyranny? The Viscount Montague rose in his place, and boldly denounced the measure. “Let them,” he said, “contrast the novelty of their own creed with the antiquity of that which they were endeavouring to suppress:”—but that suppression was not the immediate object: want of money—that dreadful epidemic—had stricken the royal council with the plague of uniformity. And Montague hit them as they deserved. “Let them reflect on the evil life and unsound opinions of those by whom they had been seduced from the religion of their fathers; and then let them, by arresting the progress of the present bill, manifest that favourable consideration for the recusants, to which their principles and their conduct so justly entitled them.” On the following day, Montague was committed to the Fleet—“for his scandalous and offensive speech.”² The Spanish ambassador ventured to intercede for the Catholics: it was in vain: James returned a peremptory refusal, and proceeded at once to let loose the whole fury of the persecution. In vain the Catholics appealed to his tender mercies—gently and covertly reminded him of the time when

¹ Jardine, ii. 23, 24; Tierney, iv. 40. See the Act in the latter, App. ix. b.

² Lords' Journal, ii. 328, 329; Tierney and Jardine, *ubi suprâ*.

their party had relieved him, as men relieve a beggar who has prospects. It was the worst thing they could do : for it summoned his pride to the defence of his ingratitude. To remind him of their services to his mother was still less to the purpose, since the whole line of his conduct proved that he considered a service to her as an injury to himself ; in fact, that he was as bereft of filial piety as he was of manly gratitude. And of what avail was it to appeal to their patience during the last reign—their readiness, at the moment of peril, to fight “in the foremost ranks of battle” against Spain’s Armada ? Nay, they did more ; they, in as many words, renounced all temporal authority but that of the king—offering to gage “life for life” for the fidelity of their clergy. All to no purpose. It was like whistling for the wind, which sailors do, merely because it is their “custom,”—and so are all these “petitions,” which are never worth their paper without something to back them, and here there was nothing of the sort. Out went the king’s replies in the shape of admonitions to the judges and magistrates, to be rigorous in enforcing the penal laws, sentences of banishment against the missionaries, appointments of courts to be held every six weeks for the conviction of recusants, who were to be denounced by every officiating clergyman, under pain of suspension. The rich were impoverished, the poor were imprisoned, the middle classes saw their goods sold, their leases seized, their cattle driven away. And some were banished in perpetuity, whilst others were executed at Warwick and Lancaster.¹

This was rather too bad—it must be allowed. Nor

¹ Tierney, with authorities, iv. 40.

can we fail to conceive how the wretched Catholics, in their bitter disappointment, were, in the quaint words of Dodd, "like persons intoxicated with strong liquor, seeming resolved to fall foul upon every one they met with." And the Protestants as well, were exasperated by this infatuated pedant of a king. His Scotchmen obtained everything—even the places already given away by Elizabeth, as well as great presents from the domains of the crown. The discontent increased from day to day on various grounds, and spread over all classes of the kingdom. The people felt no alleviation in any quarter whatever, but the reverse in every direction. They had been habituated to see Elizabeth in public, to give her applause, and receive her thanks :—but the Scotchman despised them—lived in retirement. Such was his "princely gift" of gratitude to a people that honoured him by permitting him to be their king. Who is the man that cannot conceive the burning indignation of men at the time, in the midst of such ample, reckless provocation on all sides ? "The upper classes," says Beaumont, "are furious against the Scotch ; nay, one has suffered the expression to escape him, that they must have *Scotch* vespers like the *Sicilian* of old."¹ The *Gunpowder Plot* was the result.

Though the antecedents be not capable of diminishing the atrocity of the crime, still they should be borne in mind, and vividly too, by all who would come to a right conclusion respecting the horrible design. It was nothing less than to blow up the House of Lords with gunpowder, at the opening of the Parliament, and thus to destroy, at a single blow, the King, the Lords,

¹ Apud Raumer, whose sixty-first letter is a very good account of this very bad king, ii. 190.

and the Commons.¹ The frightful idea was not original. Similar scenes of vengeance had preceded it in that age of iniquity. "There be recounted in histories," says Parsons, "many attempts of the same kind, and some also by Protestants, in our days ;—as that of them, who in Antwerp placed a whole bark of powder in the vaulted great street of that city, where the Prince of Parma, with his nobility, was to pass ; and that of him in Hague, that would have blown up the whole council of Holland, upon private revenge ; as also that of Edinburgh in Scotland, where the like train of powder was laid for the cruel murder of his majesty's father." Speaking of the last of these instances and comparing it with the present, Whittaker says, "The Scotch was plainly the parent, and the English the child—*improbis*

¹ The infatuated as well as atrocious scheme was as follows : "First, that Fawkes, as a man of approved courage, and of experience in emergencies, should be entrusted to set fire to the mine. This he was to do by means of a slow burning match, which would allow him full a quarter of an hour for his escape before the explosion took place. He was instantly to embark on board a vessel in the river, and to proceed to Flanders with the intelligence of what had been done. Secondly, Sir Everard Digby was to assemble a number of Catholic gentlemen on the 5th of November, at Dunchurch, in Warwickshire, under the pretence of hunting on Dunsmoor Heath ; from which place, as soon as they received notice that the blow was struck, a party was to be dispatched to seize the Princess Elizabeth, at the house of Lord Harrington, near Coventry. The princess was to be immediately proclaimed queen, in case of a failure in securing the person of the Prince of Wales or the young Duke of York, and a regent was to be appointed during the minority of the new sovereign. Having secured and proclaimed the princess, Catesby proposed that they should seize the horses at Warwick Castle, and the store of armour belonging to Lord Windsor, at Wheelwell Grange, in Worcestershire ; 'and, by that time,' said he, 'I hope some friends will come and take our parts.' Thirdly, Percy was to seize the Prince of Wales, or, if he should be in the Parliament House with the king, he was to take possession of the Duke of York in the palace, to which he would have ready access by means of his office of gentleman-pensioner. He might do this under the pretext of securing his person from danger, and then, taking him to a carriage prepared for the purpose, he was to carry him with all speed to Dunchurch."—*Jardine*, ii. 56 ; also *Lingard*, ix. 48. Verily might Lingard say that "*their* passions were inflamed—their imaginations excited !"—*Ibid.* 49.

ille puer, crudelis tu quoque mater."¹ The chief contrivers of the plot were Catesby, the prime-mover, a man who had been involved in the Earl of Essex's insurrection, and other treasonable projects ;—Wright, who was implicated in the same insurrection and had been sent on the embassy to the King of Spain, at the death of Elizabeth, as from "the English Catholics," *i.e.*, the faction which covered itself with that comprehensive appellation ;—Winter, the third, had been deeply engaged in all the intrigues of the faction with the King of Spain ;—the three men were of family, more or less reduced—more or less zealous Catholics—and "hunger-starved for innovation." There were others—among the rest Guy Fawkes, whose name has become as immortal as that of any hero of earth—because he undertook the desperate office of firing the mine—and yet, according to the Jesuit Greenway, who knew all the conspirators intimately, Fawkes was "a man of great piety, of exemplary temperance, of mild and cheerful demeanour, an enemy to broils and disputes, a faithful friend, and remarkable for his punctual attendance upon religious observances."² Meanwhile, after the concoction of the plot, redoubled severities on the part of the government against the Catholics, exasperated the conspirators and expedited their preparations. One aged Catholic gentleman ventured to petition the king in behalf of his suffering brethren : he was seized, carried before the Privy Council, and prosecuted in the Star Chamber before the Lords Temporal and Lords Spiritual. He was sentenced to imprisonment, to stand on the pillory, and, of course, to pay a fine, which was 1000*l.*—all for presenting a petition to the Solomon of England.

¹ Tierney, iv. 42.

² Jardine, ii. 26, *et seq.*

And there were actually many members of the Court who proposed "that the old man should be nailed to the pillory, and have both his ears cut off"! Only one or two voices made the negative majority.¹

The conspirators went on with their preparations. For more than a year had these "gentlemen of name and blood" been employed about the "action," as the venerable Fawkes qualifies the doers and the deed. The fatal day approached: one of the conspirators, anxious to save his friend, Lord Mounteagle, wrote him a letter of "warning," to absent himself from the parliament—as the tale ran: but it is highly probable that the disclosure of the plot was a direct act of "treachery" by one of the members. On the 5th of November, 1605, Fawkes had just "ended his work" of preparation when he was seized in the act of emerging from the cellar beneath the House of Parliament. He at once avowed his purpose, and declared to the person who seized him, that "if he had happened to be within the house when he took him, he would not have failed to have blown him up, house and all:"—there were thirty-six barrels of powder in the mine. The other conspirators were subsequently apprehended; and three Jesuits, Garnet, Gerard, and Greenway, were implicated in the design as accomplices in the preparation—in effect, all the conspirators belonged to the Jesuit-faction:²—it is in the highest degree improbable that any of the Secular Catholics, whether priests or laymen, were acquainted with the Gunpowder Treason.³ The conspirators, eight in number, were tried

¹ Jardine, ii. 37; Winwood, ii. 36; Tierney, iv. 41.

² *Guy Fawkes* had long been connected with the Jesuits: his name, among other suspicious signatures, occurs in a petition "got up" by the Jesuits in favour of the Company, during the disputes among the Catholics in Flanders.—*Tierney*, iii. p. 39, note.

³ Jardine, ii. 188.

and executed as traitors, protesting that "their only object was to relieve themselves and their brethren from the cruelty of the persecutors, and to restore a worship which, in their consciences, they believed to be the true worship of Christ ; and for this they had risked, and for this they were ready to sacrifice, their fortunes and their lives." But when a Scottish nobleman asked Fawkes for what end he had collected so many barrels of gunpowder, the man o' the lantern replied : "To blow the Scottish beggars back to their native mountains." James pronounced him the English Scævola.¹

The Jesuits Gerard and Greenway, after many adventures, escaped to the Continent.² Garnet sent to the council a protestation of his innocence, and concealed himself at Hendlip, near Worcester. His hiding-place was betrayed, and a magistrate proceeded to seize the

¹ Lingard, ix. 58, 56.

² Greenway first tried to avoid detection in the populous streets of London : but, soon after his arrival, whilst he was one day standing in a crowd and reading the proclamation for his apprehension, he observed a man intently watching him, and comparing his person with the minute description of him in the proclamation. Greenway retired : the man followed him, and seizing him by the arm, said : "You are known : I arrest you in the king's name : you must go with me to the council." The Jesuit, with great composure, assured him that he was not the man he supposed him to be ; but accompanied him quietly until they came to a remote and unfrequented street, where Greenway, being a powerful man, suddenly seized his companion, and, after a violent struggle, disengaged himself, escaped, and soon after was on board a small trading vessel bound to Flanders.—*Juvenci*, lib. xiii. ; *Bartoli*, lib. vi. ; *Jardine*, ii. 195. His real name was *Tesmond*, or *Tesimond*, and he had been instrumental in discovering and denouncing the "Bye Conspiracy," for which Raleigh was condemned to death, and Watson, the *secular* priest, was executed (*Oliver, Collect.*) Watson, at the gallows, accused the Jesuits of having "cunningly and covertly drawn him into the action for which he suffered." Indeed, the greatest hostility existed between the parties—and there could be no wonder that the Jesuit-faction should denounce their opponents to their destruction.—*Lingard*, ix. 18, note. Gerard and the archpriest were those of the faction who took an active part in the disclosure to the government.—*Abbot, Antilogia*, 130, *et seq.* ; *Lingard*, ix. 12.

Jesuit. The lady of the house, in the absence of her husband, gave up the keys with an air of cheerfulness : every apartment was rigorously and repeatedly searched, and guards were stationed by day and night in each passage, and at all the outlets. Three days passed, and no discovery was made : but on the fourth two strange men suddenly appeared in the gallery, and were instantly apprehended. They were Owen, Garnet's servant, and the servant of Oldcorne, another Jesuit, whom hunger had compelled to leave their hiding-place. The search proceeded :—nine other secret chambers were discovered ; and on the eighth day an opening was found into the apartment in which the two Jesuits lay concealed.¹ For seven days and seven nights had these two Jesuits been confined in a place where they were forced to remain continually sitting, with their legs painfully bent beneath them. "When we came forth," wrote Garnet to his spiritual attendant Anne Vaux, "we appeared like two ghosts . . . The fellow that found us ran away for fear, thinking we should have shot a pistol at him." Marmalade and other sweetmeats were found lying by them ; but their better maintenance had been by a quill or reed, through a little hole in the chimney that backed another chimney into a gentlewoman's chamber, and by that passage caudle, broths, and warm drinks had been conveyed to them."²

¹ Lingard, ix. 59 ; Jardine, ii. 206.

² Jardine, *ubi suprâ* ; MSS. Harl. 360. The lay-brother Owen, Garnet's servant, was the unrivalled contriver of the numerous hiding places in use among the proscribed Catholics. He sprang mines, made subterraneous passages, buttressed with walls, ending in impenetrable recesses, after winding round the thousand corners of the labyrinth. The entrances to these dens he rendered completely imperceptible, by the strange devices with which they were concealed. Nay, he would rigidly keep the secret of the various recesses, so

A bill of attainder had been introduced into Parliament summarily convicting eight Jesuits and others who had never been arraigned or heard in their own defence ; that such as were then living might be put to death at the king's pleasure, and that the property of all should be forfeited to the crown. A proposition more unjust and illegal had never been made to Parliament since the

that the den of one Catholic was never known to another. With this view he devised and constructed them entirely without assistance, in complete secrecy, and with incredible labour—having sometimes to break through thick walls, and excavate the solid rock, though he was diminutive of stature, and therefore went by the name of Little John. By his artifice many of the priests were saved from their pursuers, and it was difficult to find one of them who had not often owed his life to this lay-brother's labyrinths.—*Tanner*, f. 73. He was dreadfully tortured on this occasion, but all to no purpose :—for sixteen years he had been faithful to his master, and he remained faithful to the end : he would tell nothing of importance, and they promised him the rack with the next examination. Complaining of illness the next day, his keeper carried him a chair to use at his dinner, and with his food a blunted knife for the purpose of cutting his meat. Owen finding fault with the coldness of the broth, besought the keeper to put it on the fire for him in an adjoining apartment ; and, as soon as the man had left the cell for this purpose, he ripped up his belly in a frightful manner with the knife. The keeper on his return observed the pale and ghastly countenance of the prisoner, and perceiving blood sprinkled on the floor, threw off the straw which the unfortunate man had drawn over him, and discovered what had happened. He then ran to inform the lieutenant, who immediately hastened to the cell with several guests who happened to be at dinner with him. In answer to their questions, the dying man declared that he had committed the act of self-destruction entirely from the apprehension of severer torture than he had suffered the day before. He expired soon afterwards, and an inquest being held upon his body in the Tower, a verdict of *felo-de-se* was returned. This statement is circumstantially made by Dr. Abbott, in his *Antilogia*, in refutation of what he calls the *calumnies* of the Jesuits respecting the mode of Owen's death. There is, perhaps, no great difference between the guilt of homicide by actual torture, and that of urging to suicide by the insupportable threat of its renewal.—*Jardine*, ii. 214, *et seq.* The Jesuits make him die under torture, preserving the fact of the ghastly wound, but stating that it was inflicted “ by the blade of the descending iron ”—which is incomprehensible ; for there was no iron-blade to descend—nay, *Tanner* gives an engraving of his torture, which was by suspension—his hands being tied together overhead, f. 74. *Tanner* of course attempts to refute the foregoing statement ; but, by his own engraving, at least, it is impossible to account for the wound as a mere accident. I need not say that this unfortunate suicide is one of the “ martyrs ” of the Jesuits.

odious bills of attainder in the reign of Henry VIII.¹ Hence you will readily believe the fact that there never was a trial more iniquitously conducted: craft, duplicity, downright falsehood, attended it throughout on both sides—each driving the other deeper and deeper into the mire of deceit and base equivocation. It was only the hope that “some more particular discovery might be made,” that induced the government to stay the proceedings on the iniquitous enactment, when the two Jesuits, Oldcorne and Garnet, were apprehended.²

The prisoners were interrogated: their servants were placed on the rack. They threatened Garnet with torture: he replied in the words of St. Basil to the Emperor Valens, under a similar threat, “Threaten boys with that”—*minare ista pueris*: but he was never, during his examinations, actually exposed to the torture; in fact, he was kindly treated in the Tower, as he admitted on his trial:³ but the object of this kindness was to throw him off his guard, as the result will attest. The warder, unlocking a door in Garnet’s cell, showed him another door on the opposite side of the wall, telling him that it was the only separation between him and Oldcorne, with whom he was at liberty to converse at his pleasure—suppressing the fact that, within a cavity formed in the passage, were actually concealed Cecil’s private secretary and a magistrate.⁴ Five times were these Jesuits thus perfidiously indulged with the means of betraying themselves, by disclosing their secrets—which was the object of the trick.⁵ Now, we may ask,

¹ Jardine, ii. 194, 195.

² Jardine, *ubi supra*.

³ Id. p. 213; Lingard, ix. 60.

⁴ Lingard, ix. 61; Jardine, ii. 215.

⁵ The government had played off the same artifice upon Winter and Fawkes; but these conspirators, either by chance or sagacity, disappointed the expectation

what credence can be placed in statements, made by spies, set forth for the very purpose of reporting against the Jesuits, to whose covert destruction they thus basely lent themselves? Nevertheless, that a conversation was carried on by the two Jesuits was certain, and Oldcorne admitted the fact. But when Garnet was asked if he had not spoken with his fellow-prisoner, he denied it most vehemently. Nay, when Oldcorne's confession was shown to him, he stoutly persisted in his negative—saying that Oldcorne might be weak enough to accuse himself falsely, but as for himself, *he* never would. Thereupon they read to him the reports of Lockerson and Forsett, the two listeners;—and then only did he acknowledge the fact, overwhelmed and abashed in his bitter humiliation. The unhappy man justified his manifest falsehood on the principle, that no man was bound to charge himself, until the matter of the charge was proved *aliunde*. In an intercepted letter written “to the fathers and brethren of the Society” on Palm-Sunday (after his trial), Garnet thus relates this story: “When the lords inquired of me concerning my conference with Hall, I denied it. They drove me to many

of the contrivers.—*Lingard*, ix. 61. Doubtless it was the apparent kindness and consideration lavished on Garnet, which threw the Jesuits into the snare. There is something dreadfully bitter in the thought that men calling themselves Christians, should thus tempt their victims already devoted to destruction. And yet, with that disgusting hypocrisy, so common in the age, these listeners, doubtless by order of the hypocrites who employed them, concluded their report as follows: “We again observed, that neither at their first meeting nor at their parting, nor in any part of their conference, they used no *one word of godliness or religion*, or *recommending themselves or their cause to God*; but all hath been how to contrive safe answers, and to concur in so much as may concern those matters they are examined of.” When the devil quotes scripture, we may respect the words, though we abominate his motive; but when infamous hypocrites talk of “godliness or religion,” it is hard not to be utterly disgusted with both. Jardine gives the reports in full, ii. p. 216, *et seq.*

protestations, which I made with equivocation. They then said that Hall had confessed the conference. I replied, 'that I would not confess it: that Hall might accuse himself falsely, but that I would not do so.' As soon as I found that they had sufficient proofs, I held my peace; the lords were scandalised at this. But what should I have done? Why was I to be denied every lawful means of escape?"¹ Thus was an important leverage gained to work on this Jesuit, who had resolved stoutly to deny every charge whatsoever, until brought home to him with irresistible conviction. The reports gave no inculpatory facts—but they excited suspicions—showed that there was some important secret as yet undiscovered; and the commissioners in their interrogatories, framed their questions on the salient points of the conversations, which constantly related to the examinations and the prospects of being able to silence the charges by the demand of proofs positive.² After repeated

¹ Abbott, *Antilogia*, p. 146; Jardine, ii. 226.

² The listeners reported, that, at one of the conversations, the Jesuits confessed each other, and that Garnet accused himself of having drunk to excess. If credit can be given to the reporters, this confession seems to confirm the imputation of drunkenness, which was repeatedly charged on Garnet by his contemporaries. Chamberlain, in a letter to Sir Dudley Carleton, dated 27th March, 1606, says, that "He (Garnet) hath been indulgent to himself in the Gate-house and in the Tower, and daily drunk sack so liberally as if he meant to drown sorrow." Dr. Abbott, an enemy, says that Garnet had an inveterate habit of drinking to excess; and relates, that "on the night before his execution he was so drunk in the Tower, that his keeper thought it right to inform Sir William Wood of the circumstance,—who, going with his wife and some other persons to his lodging, found him in a disgusting state of intoxication, speaking thickly and inarticulately, and, in the idiocy of drunkenness, inviting each of them, as they came in, to drink with him."—*Antilogia*, p. 194. As Jardine observes, "this story might pass, with the other stories of Garnet's immoralities, related by Abbott, as a mere slander, did it not receive some confirmation from his confession to Hall:" but alas! how are we to arrive at certainty respecting assertions on either side, in these times? By the showing of Parsons and other Jesuits, it would seem that some of the secular priests, their opponents, were deep in the lowest immorality.

examinations, Garnet at last admitted, with much difficulty and prevarication, that the design of blowing up the Parliament House had been revealed to him in July, 1605, by Greenway, who had received it in confession from Catesby, and, as he believed, also from Thomas Winter . . . He declared, however, that he endeavoured to dissuade Catesby from his purpose, and desired Greenway to do the same ; and that he obtained from the former a promise that “he would not proceed in the matter before he (Garnet) had acquainted the pope generally with the state of England, and had taken his advice and direction therein.” He said also that he advised Catesby to send Sir Edmund Baynham to Rome for that purpose. But he further admitted that Catesby and Thomas Winter had, a twelvemonth before, mentioned to him generally that a design was on foot against the government, in consequence of the king’s breach of promise with the Catholics, but without explaining the particulars—that he again discouraged all attempts at insurrection, to the utmost of his power, saying that it was against the express and earnest command of Pope Clement VIII., as signified to him by a letter from the general of the Jesuits—nay, proceeding with these bold assertions, he said he had written, about May, 1605, to the pope “for staying of all commotions, and received answer from the pope about midsummer, wherewith he acquainted Catesby : and that about the beginning of July he wrote again to the pope, and certified that he hoped to stay all general stirs ; but, for that he feared *some particular stratagem*, he desired the pope to grant a prohibition under censures.”¹ Now, in

¹ Jardine, ii. 227. Watson makes a statement which seems to throw some light on what is to follow. “About this same time (1603-4) there was such

the face of all these specious assertions, we find that his general, Aquaviva, writing a letter to him, dated June 25th, 1605, evidencing that neither the general nor the pope had been informed by Garnet of what was in agitation, though the fact had transpired abroad. Aquaviva writes : “ We have understood, though very secretly, (*and I am persuaded that your reverence has been made acquainted with the transaction,*) namely, that the Catholics are now planning and preparing somewhat for liberty.¹ As this affair, at this time especially, will not only inflict many and most grievous difficulties on religion, but will even endanger the Catholics themselves to the utmost, his Holiness has enjoined me to write to your reverence in his name, in order that, *in every attempt you may treat with these noblemen and gentlemen,* especially with the archpriest, and prevent them from

posting up and down of Gerard, Oldcorne, Darcy, Blount, and other Jesuits and Jesuited persons, as made it apparent that some great matter was in hammering and working amongst them, though kept close as by no means I could find it out :—only thus much I got out, that they had gathered a great mass of money together, amounting to a million of pounds, as one, or of crowns, as another reported, to levy an army undoubtedly therewith, when time should serve for it,” &c., stating the various pretences on which the money was collected, and the secrecy of the scheme, which “ was not mentioned by any but of the Spanish faction.”—*Watson to the Lords of the Council*. State Paper Office ; Tierney, iv. App. i.

¹ “*Intelleximus, etsi plene admodum secretò, quod ipsum istic reverentiam vestram cognovisse mihi persuadeo, catholicos nonnihil jam meditari molirique pro libertate.*” Mr. Tierney, alluding to the apologists of Garnet, appends a note to the words in italics, as follows : “ Eudæmon Joannes [the Jesuit *L'Heureux*] (pp. 249, 250,)—More [the Jesuit historian of the English Province], and others, profess to give this letter as it was written,—“*rescripsit in hæc verba ;*” but, besides other variations, they wholly omit the introductory part of the first sentence, which I have printed in italics, and then assure us that the letter was a reply to certain earnest representations made by Garnet, in the preceding month, as to the “ desperate ” designs of some Catholics. The words here supplied, however, distinctly show that Garnet had made no such representations, and that the intelligence, obtained at Rome, had been derived from a different source.”—iv. p. cviii. Append. xviii.

agitating such designs, lest they be executed,¹ for the sake of the reasons above specified, but especially on this account, namely, that his Holiness, who, besides entirely disapproving of such machinations, amongst those Catholics, affirms that they will utterly obstruct the greater benefits which, in his clemency and benignity, his Holiness is meditating, and is endeavouring to effectuate in behalf of those Catholics: since it is certain that his Holiness will never be found wanting—nor is wanting in the present circumstances, meditating, as I have said, and seeking those means whereby they may be aided *peacefully*, and by *safer events*.² Wherefore, since you know the importance and necessity of the matter, you will endeavour by all means to induce them to desist from such designs—since, indeed, in addition to the former reasons, which are of the highest importance and weight, there is another by no means contemptible, because it will even be for the advantage of the Catholic cause—for should it happen, which God forbid, it will inflict no small damage on *our Company*—since no one will easily believe that these things have been brought about without the *consent, at least, of Our men*. 25th June, 1605.”³ Now, if the general himself “was persuaded” that Garnet was acquainted with the design, surely it could not be thought unreasonable if all the world were similarly persuaded. And Garnet admitted the fact in his reply to the general—admitted that he knew of these

¹ “Ut omni conatu cum principibus istis ac dominis, præsertim cum domino archipresbytero agat, efficiatque ne ejusmodi cogitata tractentur, nedum perficiantur.”

² “Ea media quibus et cum pace et securioribus eventibus adjuventur.”

³ “Quia, si eveniret, quod Deus avertat, non mediocrem damnum offeret Societati nostræ, cum non ita facile quis crediderit, hæc sine nostrorum saltem consensu factitata esse. 25 Junii, 1605.” Copy in the State Paper Office,—*apud Tierney*, iv. *Append.* xviii.

treasonable machinations—admitted that, instead of denouncing them to the government, as Greenway, *alias* Tesmond, had done—as Gerard had done, in the case of the “Bye Conspiracy,” that affair of two *secular priests*—he had only given the conspirators his *advice* to desist!¹ And he says nothing as to the pretext afterwards put forth, that the communication was made to him *in confession*. The letter is dated July 24, 1605—and, therefore, may fairly be referred to the period to which he alluded, when he admitted that “the design of blowing up the Parliament House with gunpowder, had been revealed to him in July 1605, by Greenway,” the Jesuit. Garnet writes :

“We have received the letter of your Paternity, which we embrace with that reverence which is due to his Holiness, and your Paternity. And, indeed, as far as I am concerned, I have four times impeded the stir, hitherto—*pro meâ parte, quater hactenus tumultum impedivi*—nor is it to be doubted that we can hinder all the public preparations of arms, since it is certain that many Catholics will attempt nothing of the kind without our consent, unless in the most urgent necessity.² But there is, however, a source of great anxiety to us, namely, lest, perchance others may fly to arms in some province, whereby necessity itself may drive the rest to similar measures ; for there are not a few who cannot be restrained by the simple

¹ Treating of his betrayal by the Jesuits, Watson says that “their vile and treacherous minds be such, as they will betray their own father and dearest friend they have in the world, for their own advantage—*et propter bonum publicum Societatis*—which they count a public or common good, though a whole commonwealth, yea, and the whole Catholic Church, be overthrown thereby.”—*Watson to the Lords of the Council*. Aug. 9, 1603 ; State Paper Office.

² “Nec dubium est, quin publicos omnes armorum apparatus prohibere possimus, cum certum sit multos Catholicos absque nostro consensu nihil ejusmodi, nisi urgente necessitate, attentare velle.”

command of his Holiness. For they dared to ask, during the lifetime of Clement, whether the pope could hinder them from defending their lives.¹ They say, moreover, that *no priest shall be made acquainted with their secrets*; but they particularly, and some friends also, complain of us that we place obstacles to their projects; and, in order that we might somehow appease them, and at least gain time—so that in the delay, proper remedies may be applied—we have exhorted them to dispatch, with common consent, some one to his Holiness, &c.²

¹ “*Est tamen quod nos valdè sollicitos tenet.*” To these words Mr. Tierney appends a note as follows: “I should inform the reader that this letter is inserted by Gerard in his MS. (c. vi. 78), and that from him, or, what is the same thing, from Greenway, it has been adopted by Eudæmon Joannes (253, 254), and by all the writers connected with the Society. In Gerard’s copy, and, of course, in all the others, the words, ‘*Est tamen quod nos valdè sollicitos tenet,*’ as they occur here, are, for a reason which will appear presently, changed into ‘*Duo tamen sunt quæ nos valdè sollicitos tenent.*’”

² “*Atque ut hos aliquo modo leniremus, et saltem tempus lucraremur, ut dilatione aliquâ adhiberi possint congrua remedia, hortati sumus ut communi consilio aliquem ad suam Sanctitatem mitterent &c.*” Here Mr. Tierney observes: “Gerard’s copy, after the word ‘*mitterent,*’ has no ‘&c.’ but, continuing the sentence, thus *proceeds*,—‘*quod factum est, eumque ad illustrissimum nuncium in Flandriam direxi, ut ab ipso suâ sanctitate commendetur, scriptis etiam literis, quibus eorum sententiam exposui, et rationes pro utràque parte.*” And so on proceeds the addition, stating the danger of “some treason or violence to the king,” and the possibility of all the Catholics being compelled to take up arms; which is only a repetition of what he wrote himself, as we have read; and then the addition suggests that his Holiness should forbid the Catholics to resort to arms by a public edict, which, again, the former part of his letter declares to be either unnecessary or useless, since he says that he had the power to hinder all public demonstrations among many Catholics, whilst there were others who set the pope at defiance, or something like it. Besides, the general’s letter was virtually a papal breve—Garnet could have done just what the archpriest did, in a letter to his assistants and clergy, quoting the identical words of the pope’s disapprobation as imparted to the general, and by him to Garnet. I may also observe that the plural form used in the letter is changed to the singular in the addition (“*exposui,*” “*meo judicio,*”) or as Mr. Tierney observes:—“To be able, in fact, to suppose that one half of the letter is hidden under this ‘&c.’ it is also necessary to suppose that the words on which I have remarked in the preceding note [*Est tamen, &c.*] have been purposely changed from the plural to the singular; that this has been effected, and that the variations, observable in the two

God must be prayed to, in order that *he* may apply some necessary remedy to these many evils. We implore the benediction of his Holiness, as also of your Paternity. At London, 24th July, 1605."

concluding sentences, have been introduced for the special purpose of concealing the omission, and that thus a piece of dishonesty has been perpetrated, which is not only without any assignable motive, but is morally incompatible with the fact, that the ' &c.' marks, and is *intended* to mark, the place where something has been omitted." Nor is it unfair to suppose that by the " &c." Garnet meant the explanation of the infernal *result*, to be given by the emissary of the conspirators. Mr. Tierney has no hesitation in preferring the copy which he has published from the State Paper Office ; "but the strongest argument in favour of the copy," adds Mr. Tierney, "is the impossibility of reconciling the date of a supposed fact, mentioned in Gerard's additions, with that of the present letter. Garnet says, that for the purpose of gaining time, he has exhorted the parties of whom he speaks to send an envoy to the pope ; and Gerard makes him add, not only that his exhortations have been effectual, but that the envoy is already (July 24) on his road. Now, it was proved on the trial of Garnet, and it was acknowledged by that Jesuit himself, that the person thus accredited to the pontiff was Sir Edmund Baynham ; that Baynham was the bearer of the letters mentioned in Gerard's copy as addressed to the nuncio, but that it was not until the latter part of September that he left England to proceed to his destination." It is an important fact, which has escaped the notice of the writers on the plot, that when Baynham quitted England, whether it was the early part, or the middle, (Jardine states both in different places), or the latter part of September, the Parliament was to meet on the 3rd of October, on which day only was it prorogued to the 5th of November ; but even supposing that he was aware of the prorogation, "it was barely possible, even if he had travelled directly to Rome with the utmost expedition, to have procured the pope's prohibition [which, by the way, Garnet thought useless], and to have returned with it to England before the 5th of November. In point of fact, Baynham used no expedition at all ; he went through Flanders and remained there some days, and did not reach Florence till the 20th of October, well knowing that the real object of his mission would be accomplished by his being at Rome as soon as the tidings of the explosion had arrived there."—*Jardine*, ii. 402. Nothing is more likely than that his delay on the road was caused by the news of the *prorogation*, so that he might not be at Rome until the infernal result had taken place ; for according to the admissions of the conspirators at the trial, Baynham was sent to Rome "in order that he might be there when the news of the explosion arrived, and be prepared to negotiate with the pope on behalf of the conspirators, and to explain to him their designs respecting the establishment of the Catholic religion in England."—*Jardine*, ii. 47. Garnet prevaricated in his explanation of this mission at the trial ; "but taking the latest and final reason alleged by Garnet, namely, that he proposed his mission to the pope in order to negotiate for the prevention of the

These letters decidedly prove that Garnet was aware of certain machinations against the government, which he did not reveal to the authorities. Such conduct was scarcely to be expected from the Jesuit, in the present

plot by a papal prohibition, is it credible, that for such a purpose he would have employed such a messenger? A man of profligate and turbulent habits, who had been engaged in Essex's rebellion, prosecuted for riots and affrays, and known as the captain of a club or society called 'the Damned Crew.' Could the superior of the Jesuits find no more fitting emissary on a message of mercy and salvation than the 'Captain of the Damned Crew'—the man of 'treasons, stratagems, and spoils,' whose turbulent and unprincipled character was so notorious in England, that the conspirators themselves thought it imprudent to entrust him with any part of the conduct of the project at home, saying that 'he was not fit for the business?'—*Jardine*, ii. 47 and 401. It was against these notorious facts that the Jesuit-apologists made the absurd addition to Garnet's sophisticated letter! Dr. Lingard seems inclined to persuade his readers that Garnet was ignorant of any particulars of the plot as late as October 4th—basing his argument on a garbled letter of Garnet to Parsons, respecting which dishonest trick I have quoted Mr. Tierney, and refer the reader to that writer for some pertinent remarks on the subject, iv. Append. c. ii. In the letter to which Dr. Lingard refers, Garnet describes the sufferings of the Catholics, and thus concludes: "So that there is no hope that Pope Paul V. can do anything: and whatsoever men give out there [at Rome] of easy proceedings with Catholics, is mere fabulous. And yet I am assured, notwithstanding, that the best sort of Catholics will bear all their losses with patience. But how these tyrannical proceedings of such base officers may drive particular men to desperate attempts, *that I cannot answer for; the King's wisdom will foresee.*"—*Lingard*, ix., 388. Now, in the circumstances, we may fairly see the drift, the *allusion* of these words which I have scored: but Dr. Lingard says: "Now it is plain, from the tenor of that letter, that Garnet was then (October 4th) ignorant of any particulars of the plot, unless we suppose that he sought, by equivocation, to impose on his superiors in Rome,—a supposition which no one acquainted with the constitution of the Order will be disposed to admit." "Constitution of the Order" forsooth! What has that to do with the question? Was Garnet complying with the "Constitution of his Order" when he carried Anne Vaux, at each remove, with him, and was so intimate with his "spiritual daughter," without supposing even that the connection was criminal? "Constitution of the Order!" And what will the doctor say to the conduct of the Spanish Jesuits, *at the very time*, against their general, as I have related? Is the doctor too well "acquainted with the Constitution of the Order" to believe those facts? I have said before, and I repeat it, that the Constitutions are one thing, and the Jesuits are another: they must be considered apart for judgment.—I need not say that the doctor's attempt fails by reason of the facts above given.

instance : nevertheless, by the law of the land, "it is plain that he incurred the legal guilt of misprision of treason" even before the proceedings against him, by such various methods of baseness, entrapped his avowals. The Jesuit continued, throughout the trial, his desperate and reckless course of equivocation and casuistical distinctions. He admitted his "*general knowledge*" of the plot ; but took refuge under the cloak of sacramental confession. Now, we remember the obloquy which the Jesuits in Spain incurred when one of the Company actually made use of information extorted from a woman in the confessional, in order to denounce her accomplice to the Inquisition : we also remember that the Jesuits defended the member, and that their historian states the doctrine with approbation.¹ I remind the reader of the fact, merely to show the constant inconsistency of the Jesuits ;—their deeds must be judged apart from their doctrinal inculcations, as it would seem :—we may err by testing their vices or their virtues by their doctrinal standard, which was never a fixture—but always adapted to particular times, and things, and places, and persons. In the present instance, the commissioners, with their usual baseness, falsely told Garnet, that

¹ See p. 40, vol. ii., of the present work for the transaction, and the Jesuit-doctrine thereupon inculcated. I there gave a condensed translation, and reserved the original for the present occasion by way of memento. "*Fas quidem, tota quamvis universitas rerum esset interitura, nunquam esse signum sacrosanctum confessionis resignare. Posse tamen incidere tempora, quibus sacerdos jure à confitente exigat, ut quempiam, sive socium participem sceleris, sive quem hæreticum aut aliâ pestilenti labe corruptum norit, si remedii nulla præterea relicta via sit, ipsemet confessorio, vel inter confessionem facta potestate eâ notitiâ utendi si correctio fraterna futura sit ; vel quod ferè præstat et ad judicalem denunciationem necessarium est, extra confessionem indicet. Quod si abnuat facere, absolvi non debeat, quemadmodum absolvi non licet, qui vel reus furti, restituere alienam rem, vel quæ debeat alia, præstare non sit paratus.*"—*Sacchin.* lib. ii. 131.

Greenway himself had declared that the disclosure of the plot was *not* made to him in confession. This added to his perplexity. He wavered,—made several attempts to reconcile his own statement with the supposed declaration of *Greenway*,—and concluded by declaring that, whatever might have been the intention of his brother, he had always considered the communication as made with reference to confession.¹ To simple Catholics it must appear strange that people should tell their *intended* crimes in confession, instead of confessing their actual sins with contrition and purposes of amendment. Few such simple Catholics will be brought to believe that the former can honestly be mentioned at confession : nor can we be pronounced unfair if we believe, with General Aquaviva, that Garnet was acquainted with *a* plot, if not *the* identical plot, notice of which had reached the general at Rome. But, in effect, what faith could be placed in the assertions of a man, whom his equally false judges were able to convict of downright, unscrupulous, unblushing falsehood ? Accordingly, when Garnet made the reply above given, the commissioners, tempting the false Jesuit, asked him whether he had not corresponded with the traitor *Greenway*, his brother Jesuit ? Garnet denied, swearing by his priesthood, that he had ever sent letter or message to *Greenway*, since they last parted. What a dreadful moment, what a harrowing, convulsive moment for the Jesuit ! The commissioners exhibited to him a letter of his to *Greenway*, which they had intercepted ! . . . He acknowledged it : but maintained that he had done nothing wrong in denying the fact,—saying that *they* were the persons to be blamed—*they* who, being in possession of the letter, had

¹ Lingard, ix. 66.

nevertheless put the question to him, as if they were not.¹ Hence we see how completely the wretched man was given over to the spirit of equivocation and falsehood: but we also behold the extent to which his enemies carried the machinations of their false hearts, to overreach the Jesuit by cajoling him into actions which, if they did not incriminate him, were capable of being made the opportunities for displaying, in its foulest aspect, the specious falsehoods of Jesuitism. In fact, the Jesuits themselves never, perhaps, surpassed these Scoto-English commissioners in craft,—wicked craft and iniquitous duplicity. And yet the latter had the conscience to condemn Garnet for his crafty equivocation! The man had gone so far into the mire that he stuck therein—and refused to emerge. Three days later he was interrogated a second time respecting the doctrine of equivocation, and boldly declared that the practice of requiring men to accuse themselves was barbarous and unjust—that in all such cases it was lawful to employ equivocation, and to confirm, if it were necessary, that equivocation with an oath; and that if Tresham, as had been pretended, had equivocated on his death-bed, he might have had reasons which would justify him in the sight of God.² “To these avowals I ascribe his execution. The man who maintained such opinions

¹ Lingard, ix. 66. Examinations in the State Paper Office.

² “This I acknowledge to be according to my opinion, and the opinion of the schoolmen. And our reason is, for that, in cases of lawful equivocation, the speech by equivocation being saved from a lie, the same speech may be without perjury confirmed by oath, or by any other usual way, though it were by receiving the sacrament, if just necessity so require.—HENRY GARNET.” Original in State Paper Office, in Garnet’s own hand-writing.—*Apud Lingard*, ix. 67, note. This phase in the career of Garnet will appear more strikingly in a subsequent page; the circumstances in which he denied having written to Greenway, will present a saddening contemplation.

could not reasonably complain, if the king refused credit to his asseverations of innocence, and permitted the law to take its course,"—this is the opinion of Dr. Lingard, the Catholic historian of England.¹ But doubtless the Jesuit would have been hanged even in the absence of these avowals. The object of all the iniquitous examinations by which the wretched man was tempted to prevaricate, to equivocate, and speak falsehood, was

¹ Lingard, vol. ix. p. 87, 2nd ed. 1825. Surely nothing could be fairer than this opinion of Dr. Lingard. It was a noble expression of moral conviction, in defiance of a casuistical inculcation—a sort of respectful tribute to the "moral sense" of the nation; and doubtless many a Protestant thereupon concluded, that though a *Jesuit* might inculcate equivocation, such doctrine was not countenanced by "the Church." But a modern Jesuit takes the doctor to task for this observation—and very sharply, too. The Jesuit of the *Documents* says: "This reflection of Dr. Lingard proves that a man may be at the same time, a great historian, a learned civilian, and a *very weak theologian* (!). The man 'who maintained *such opinions*' [Garnet] was a man who maintained a doctrine *approved by the universal church*. Cette reflexion, qui est du D. Lingard, prouve qu'on peut être à la fois un grand historien, un savant jurisconsulte, et un très foible théologien. L'homme 'qui soutenait de *telles opinions*' était un homme qui soutenait une doctrine *approuvée de toute l'Eglise*."—*Documents*, i.; *Conspirat. des Poudres*, p. 54, note. This was a hard hit on the doctor, and it seems to have taken effect; for, in the subsequent edition of his work, he has modified the text, mystified it somewhat by additions, and otherwise obscured the moral conviction aforesaid, as follows: "To these *and similar* avowals I ascribe his execution. *By seeking shelter under equivocation, he had deprived himself of the protection which the TRUTH might have afforded him* (!); nor could he in such circumstances reasonably complain, if the king refused credit," &c., ed. of 1844, vol. ix. p. 67. But the Jesuit does not stop short with administering a rebuke to the doctor; for, thereupon, in these our very modern times, he proceeds to *justify* equivocation by the highest authority that Christians can appeal to. In former times—in those bad times for religion—that disgraceful epoch of Christianity—there was nothing to be wondered at when the Jesuit L'Heureux took Casaubon to task, for saying that he knew not what authorities Garnet could have for his doctrine of equivocation. "Thou say'st that thou dost not know what authorities he could have. If thou hadst turned over the holy Bible, as thou hast turned over the Neros and Caligulas of Suetonius—if thou hadst read Augustin, Gregory, the other Fathers, thou wouldst have found that the Patriarchs, the Prophets, and *God himself* are the authorities" [of Garnet's equivocation !].—*Eulæmon Joan. Resp. ad Epist. Is. Casaub.* c. viii. p. 164, ed. Col. Agrip. 1612. "*Nescire te ais, quos auctores habuerit. Si perinde sacra Biblia, ut Suetonii Caligulas, ac Neronæ versasses,—si Augustinum, si Gregorium, si alios Patres legisses; jam*

nothing more than to expose a leader of Romanism, a Jesuit, and to gratify the disreputable theological curiosity of the king. Garnet's doom had been certain from the first: by the law of the land he stood at once guilty of death by his presence in the kingdom as a Jesuit. To read the complete account of the trial, so admirably given by Jardine, is a bitter task—one of those transactions which present not a single redeeming feature to palliate a great iniquity. We may be permitted to say—

dudum auctores ejus Patriarchas, Prophetas, *Deum ipsum* invenisses.” The book has on the title page “*permissu Superiorum*,” and, further, the *imprimatur* of Aquaviva himself, on the report, and at the approval, of three theologians of the Company. It may be worth while to let the modern Jesuit (Lingard's reprover) state the definition of equivocation—which so many talk about without exactly knowing what a Jesuit means, or may mean, by the famous, or rather infamous, term. “Equivocation properly so called,” says the Jesuit of the *Documents*, “is a proposition with several meanings—à *plusieurs sens*—amongst which one is *true*, and which may be recognised by those who understand that proposition, if they have sufficient discernment to supply what is wanting to that which is not explained—*s'ils ont assez de discernement pour suppléer à ce qui n'est pas expliqué*,”—a somewhat cloudy definition:—but the modern Jesuit vouchsafes an example—a sample—and it is nothing less than “OUR LORD !” “Our Lord,” says he, “gave an example of it, when he said: ‘I go not up unto this feast’ (John vii. 8), and yet he went secretly (ib. 10): all the circumstances of this passage prove that he meant to say: I go not up [publicly].—N. S. en a donné un exemple, lorsqu'il dit: *Non ascendo ad diem festum hunc* (je n'irai point à cette fête) . . , et cependant il y alla en secret; toutes les circonstances de ce passage prouvent qu'il voulait dire: *Non ascendo (manifesté)*—Je n'irai point publiquement.” The blasphemous absurdity of twisting this text into an equivocation is at once obvious; but the Jesuit makes it an “equivocation” by omitting the part which *was* “explained,” namely, *quia meum tempus nondum impletum est*—for my time is not yet fully come:—then he abode in Galilee (ibid. 9); but, subsequently—when his time was fully come—after his disciples had preceded him, at his bidding, “he also went up unto the feast.” The portion of the text omitted to construct the “equivocation,” happens to be absolutely necessary to qualify the sense—for there could be no doubt as to the *requirement of the law* being complied with, by the Redeemer; the only question being, the *appointed time*. Even the word “yet” in the Greek, and in the Protestant translation, is rendered unnecessary by the context. Surely it was enough that Porphyry, the anti-christian, taxed this text with “falsehood,” (as the Jesuit ought to have known) without this Jesuit's attempt to twist it into an equivocation, which Francis of Sales, in his *Philothea*, if I remember rightly, says is worse than a lie. After this

Would to heaven that the Gunpowder Plot had never occurred, so that humanity might have been spared the guilty disgrace of so unjust, unchristian a trial! The closing scene was of a piece with every act and scene of the disgusting drama.

On the 3rd of April, Garnet wrote a letter to Anne Vaux.¹ It was after another attempt to circumvent the

"example of our Lord," the Jesuit gives another from a "Saint Athanas," and then he summarily appeals, quoting the "Conferences of Angers," to St. Raymond, St. Antoninus, Angelinus. &c., and to *six* formidable casuists, *videlicet*, Soto, Victoria, Medina, Bannès, Navarre, Toledo.—*Documents*, i. *Conspiration des Poudres*, p. 55. If this Jesuit of the *Documents* thus pronounced Dr. Lingard "a very weak theologian" for his apparent condemnation of his Company's favourite equivocation, what could he say to the erudite and most devout Alban Butler, and the very light of the Gallican Church, the famous Bossuet, who severely condemned the use of equivocation? Parsons, of course, was a staunch advocate of the practice, as exhibited particularly in his "Treatise on Mitigation towards Catholic subjects." Alban Butler observes (*Life of Sir T. Matthews*, p. 27) "that the attempts of Parsons to vindicate the use of equivocations alarm the judicious reader, and deserve a severe animadversion." At the assembly of the Gallican clergy, in 1700, Bossuet announced, "that to use equivocations or mental reservations, was to give to the words and phrases of language an arbitrary meaning, framed at will, only understood by the speaker, and contrary to the meaning which the rest of the world would give them." He remarked that, "one is not called upon to justify all those words of holy men, in which some truth may be found; that it is better to describe them as human weaknesses, their proper name, rather than to excuse them by the artificial terms of equivocations and mental reservations, in which concealment and bad faith would be manifest"—an evident rebuke to the men of the "celebrated" Company.—*Bausset's Hist. de Bossuet*, l. xi. See *Butler's Mem.* ii. p. 171.

¹ This lady was the daughter of Lord Vaux. She constantly accompanied Garnet in his peregrinations. As often as the Jesuit was compelled to change his residence, the faithful Anne was by his side, with woman's consoling affection and boundless admiration, to cheer him in the midst of his ceaseless perils. Garnet thus infringed his rule, so stringent in the matter of female intercourse; but, is it absolutely necessary to believe that this affectionate, faithful woman was ever more to the Jesuit than a friend, intensely loving, and *therefore* cherished in that unblemished purity, for which she merited defence by her generous devotedness? Still, it is not surprising that such a connection should have been ascribed to bonds less pure than those of religious or Platonic attachment. It would be idle, of course, to investigate at length the merits of a tale of scandal more than two centuries old. Garnet solemnly denied the imputation at his execution; and his intercepted letters from the Tower, show no feeling

Jesuit by giving him false information. Protestant clergymen lent themselves to the infamous machination. They told him that multitudes had forsaken the Catholic Church in disgust at his admissions and his accusation

towards Anne Vaux, beyond that of paternal regard ; and though the language of some of her letters is sufficiently excited and passionate, they express only the agony of distress at the loss of a valued friend, upon whose advice and society she had long habitually relied ; they are, in fact, such letters as any religious devotee might have written to a spiritual protector, under similar circumstances. For instance, in answer to a note, in which he informed her that Oldcorne (Hall), his fellow-prisoner, had dreamed that "he and Garnet were transported to two fair tabernacles ;" Anne Vaux writes as follows, and beautifully too :— "Mr. Hall's dream had been a great comfort, if at the foot of the throne, there had been *a seat for me*. God and you know my unworthiness : I beseech you to help me with your prayers. Your's, and not my own, A. V." In a subsequent note she says : "If this come safe to you, I will write [again] ; and so will more friends, who would be glad to have direction from you, who should supply your room. For myself, I am forced to seek new friends ; my old are [tired] of me. I beseech you, for God's sake, advise me what course to take so long as I may hear from you. Not out of London, my hope is that you will continue your care of me, and commend me to some that, for your sake, will help me. To live without you is not life, but death. Now I see my loss. I am and always will be your's, and so I beseech you to account me. O that I might see you ! Your's." These sentiments breathe a deep attachment ; but it must be a poor heart indeed that will argue thence the confirmation of the scandal which coupled the name of Anne Vaux with that of Garnet. It is not perhaps immaterial to consider that at this period, Anne was upwards of forty, and Garnet more than fifty years of age.—*Jardine*, ii. 199. And when we consider the dreary, sad, desolate, life of the Jesuit, in that wilderness of blood to the traitors of "the faith," wherein his bitter lot was cast—and when we know that woman's love and approval build a fortress of impregnable comfort round the heart in the battle of life—we may congratulate this Jesuit that he lacked not the blessing ;—and if it has ever happened to us thus to be circumstanced—thus to be blessed—and yet to have remained generously contented with that all-sufficient love and approval—then we may freely and gladly award respectful unsuspecting admiration to the friendship of the faithful Anne and the Jesuit Garnet. I for one will believe her pure, and the Jesuit not guilty ; for, in the absence of proof to the contrary, it is a relief, in the bitter narrative of these events, to find one faithful, gentle heart beaming on the forlorn criminal, even as that sun which God "maketh to rise on the evil and on the good."—Anne constantly maintained Garnet's innocence of the plot, as she attested at her examination, when imprisoned on account of her known connection with Garnet. But there is no evidence that she knew of the plot before it was discovered : she protested that she did not ; and there is no proof in her examinations to implicate her in the transaction,

of Greenway, which you remember was torn from the man by a falsehood. They even hinted that Greenway was taken. All this was to induce him to write explanations to his friends, in self-defence ; and opportunities for such communication were insidiously thrown in his way, whilst his letters were intercepted and brought to the Council. Garnet was anxious to clear himself with his Catholic friends, for the false information filled his mind with dismay, whilst he dreaded that further scandal would arise from the disclosures which Greenway might make in his supposed captivity. His whole defence had rested upon the assurance of Greenway's escape ; and if that Jesuit were now taken and examined he might give a totally different account of the transaction, and betray all. His letter to Anne, which she never received, consisted of explanations and a defence of his conduct. After giving her advice respecting the best mode of disposing of herself after his death, he says :—"I understand, by the doctors which were with me, and by Mr. Lieutenant, that great scandal was taken at my arraignment, and five hundred Catholics turned Protestants ; which, if it should be true, I must think that many other Catholics are scandalised at me also. I desire all to judge of me in charity ; for, I thank God most humbly, in all my speeches and actions I have had a desire to do nothing against the glory of God ; and so I will touch, as near as I remember, every point. I found

except her near relationship to some of the conspirators, and her intimacy with all of them, and, of course, her adherence to Garnet after he was declared a traitor by royal proclamation.—*Ibid.* ii. 63, 64. At the trial, the Earl of Salisbury said to Garnet : "This gentlewoman, Mr. Garnet, hath harboured you these twelve years last past, and seems to speak for you in her confessions ; I think she would sacrifice herself for you to do you good, and you likewise for her."—*Ibid.* 309.

myself so touched by all that have gone before, but especially by the testimony of two that did hear our confessions and conferences, and *misunderstand us*, that I thought it would make our actions much more excusable to tell the truth than to stand to the torture or trial by witnesses. *I acknowledged that Mr. Greenwell* [Greenway] *only told me in confession*; yet so that I might reveal it after I should be brought in question for it. I also said that I thought he had it in confession, so that he could reveal it to none but to me; and so neither of us was bound, or could reveal it [*i. e.* we were not bound, and might reveal it]. I thought Mr. Greenwell was beyond sea, and that he could have no harm; but if he be here, in their fingers, I hope his charity is such, that he would be content to bear part with me. *He was so touched that my acknowledgments* did rather excuse him; for I said (as it was true) that we both conspired to hinder it. And so I hope he did. For Bate's accusation is of no credit, he revealing confession, if it were true. For matters of the pope's authority, of *sigillum confessionis* [the seal of confession,] of equivocation, I spoke as moderately as I could, and as I thought I was bound; if any were scandalised thereat, it was not my fault, but their own. The breves I thought necessary to acknowledge for many causes, especially Mr. Catesby having grounded himself thereon, and not on my advice. I remember nothing else that could scandalise. But I was *in medio illusorum* [in the midst of deceivers], and it may be, Catholics may also think strange that we should be acquainted with such things [the Plot]; but who can hinder but he must know things sometimes which he would not? I never allowed it: I sought to hinder it more than men can imagine, as the pope will tell: it

was not my part, as I thought, to disclose it. I have written a detestation of that action for the king to see ; and I acknowledge myself not to die a victorious martyr, but a penitent thief, as I hope I shall do ; and so will I say at the execution, whatsoever others have said or held before. Let everybody consider, if they had been twenty-three times examined before the wisest of the realm, besides particular conferences with Mr. Lieutenant, what he could have done under so many evidences. For the conspirators thought themselves sure, and used my name freely ; though, I protest, none of them ever told me anything, yet have I hurt nobody * * * Howsoever I shall die a thief, yet you may assure yourself your innocency is such, that I doubt not but if you die by your imprisonment, you shall die a martyr. *For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God.* Farewell, my always most beloved in Christ, and pray for me !”¹

On the following day Garnet sent to the Council the declaration alluded to in the foregoing letter as written for the king to see.

“ 4^o April.

“ I Henry Garnet, of the Society of Jesus, Priest, do here freely protest before God, that I hold the late intention of the Powder Action to have been altogether unlawful and most horrible, as well in respect of the injury and treason to his Majesty, the Prince, and others that should have been sinfully murdered at that time, as also in respect of infinite other innocents, which should have been present. I also

¹ The text and conclusion are in Latin. “ 1 Pet. iv. *Tempus est ut incipiat judicium à domo Dei. Vale, mihi semper dilectissima in Christo, et ora pro me !* 3^o April.” The letter is taken from Garnet’s autograph in the State Paper Office by Jardine, who remarks that, “ it was Garnet’s usual custom to conclude his letters to Anne Vaux with fragments of text from the Vulgate [the Latin Bible] or from the Roman Liturgy, not always very apposite to the subject of his communications.”—*Jardine*, ii. 322. Orange-juice was the fluid used instead of ink ; it became legible by being held to the fire.

protest that I was ever of opinion that it was unlawful to attempt any violence against the king's majesty and the estate after he was once received by the realm. Also I acknowledge that I was bound to reveal all knowledge that I had of this or any other treason out of the sacrament of confession. And whereas, partly upon hope of prevention, partly for that I would not betray my friend, I did not reveal the general knowledge of Mr. Catesby's intention which I had by him, I do acknowledge myself highly guilty, to have offended God, the king's majesty and estate; and humbly ask of all forgiveness; exhorting all Catholics whatsoever, that they no way build upon my example, but by prayer and otherwise seek the peace of the realm, hoping in his Majesty's merciful disposition, that they shall enjoy their wonted quietness, and not bear the burden of mine or others' defaults or crimes. In testimony whereof I have written this with my own hand. HENRY GARNET."

"Both the above papers," says Jardine, "are still in existence at the State Paper Office in Garnet's handwriting; and no doubt can exist either as to their genuineness or their contents. They contain nothing positively inconsistent with Garnet's statement on the trial; taken by themselves, indeed, they rather strengthen his defence; but it will be observed that he takes care to define exactly the extent of the admissions which he had made, which might be for the information and guidance of Greenway in his answers, supposing he was taken; and the whole scope and object of the letter to Anne Vaux is not to justify himself from the imputation of being in fact an accessory to the plot, but to excuse himself from the accusation of weakness in having acknowledged so much as he had done, by showing that he had admitted no more either against himself or Greenway than had been already proved beyond the possibility of contradiction."¹ It was actually

¹ Garnet's Examination, 25th April, 1606.; State Paper Office; Jardine, ii. 324.

on the same day, April 4th, that Garnet wrote the letter to Greenway—by way of caution as to what he had avowed—and afterwards affirmed “upon his priesthood, that he did never write any letter or letters, nor send any message to Greenway since he was at Coughton; and this he protested to be spoken *without* equivocation”!¹ Strongly as we abhor the disgraceful temptation of falsehood by which he was entrapped—truly as we may make every allowance for the Jesuit’s infatuated conscience—and sympathise with a man in such a dilemma—yet, on the verge of eternity, thus to forswear himself, exhibits one of the most dismal features of his perverted mind—casting the darkest shade of doubt on all his representations. And yet, can it be supposed that it was merely to save his life that Garnet asseverated these solemn falsehoods? It would seem so from his supplication to the king for mercy:—but we must also give the Jesuit credit, if such it be, for that anxiety which made him dread to compromise his Company—a conspicuous sentiment in the Jesuits, which, if it be not inexcusable, certainly renders them, on all occasions, unsafe authorities as to events which relate to their Company. On their “priesthood,” on their “salvation,” by the God who was to judge them hereafter, they thought themselves expediently permitted to *swear* anything by equivocation—just as they might *undertake* anything by the doctrine of probabilism, or that which permits conscience to be overruled by the decisions of others—provided they be “learned.” Following in a similar track, Garnet’s apologists have exhausted their wits to make it a technical instead of a moral question; and whilst no man, I believe, can read the

¹ Ibid. *ut antea*.

documents I have copied, and the facts admitted on all hands, without the conviction that Garnet was, as his general expressed it, "conscious of the thing"—yet has Jesuitical perversity been able still to keep it an open question amongst the damaging facts which attest the abuse of the religious sentiment, by those who pretend to be its angels unto happiness here and hereafter.

The Jesuit's doom was pronounced; and yet they continued the tormenting, disreputable, immoral examinations of the man whom they believed, with reason, to be a confirmed prevaricator, and unscrupulous equivocator—a perjurer; as though they cared not if they tempted the sinner still more to sin against his God—provided they could make useful discoveries for the sake of their party. Yet these were the immaculates who denounced the immoral doctrines of the Jesuits—their unscrupulous recklessness as to the *means* by which their *ends* were promoted. I believe they were more guilty than the Jesuits—for, after all, these Jesuits upheld certain principles by which they believed their conduct justified: whereas their Protestant opponents and deceivers had no such "excuse" for their iniquity:—where the former lied conscientiously, so to speak, the latter practised deceit against their consciences, prevaricated with the knowledge of the sin, and lied with deliberate malice in the presence of the God of Truth, whom they pretended to serve. A few days before Garnet's execution several divines of the English Protestant Church visited him in the Tower, for the *alleged* purpose of giving him such spiritual assistance as his situation required, but really perhaps by the direction of the king, says Jardine,—in order to draw from him further information respecting the faith and doctrine of the Jesuits. Among other persons present on this occasion,

besides Sir William Waad (the person who intercepted Garnet's letters), there were Dr. James Montague, the Dean of the Chapel Royal; Dr. Neile, one of the king's chaplains and Dean of Westminster; and Dr. John Overall, Dean of St. Paul's—all of them clergymen of distinguished learning and—piety.¹ And they “put questions” to the Jesuit, and their account of his answers are recorded, but their account is not worth recording:² notwithstanding the frightful distress of mind in which they found the wretched man—they dangled with his unspeakable anguish, as reflected in the following letter—probably the last he ever wrote—to the faithful Anne—but intercepted as a matter of course.

“It pleaseth God daily to multiply my crosses. I beseech him give me patience and perseverance—*usque in finem*—[unto the end]. I was, after a week's hiding, taken in a friend's house, where our confessions and secret conferences were heard, and my letters taken by some indiscretion abroad;—then the taking of yourself;—after my arraignment;—then the taking of Mr. Greenwell;—then the slander of us both abroad;—then the ransacking anew of Erith and the other house;—then the execution of Mr. Hall;—and now, last of all, the apprehension of Richard and Robert; with a cipher, I know not of whose, laid to my charge, and that which was a singular oversight, a letter in cipher, together with the ciphers;—which letter may bring many into question.

“*Suffer etiam hos*;—ye have heard, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy. May the name of the Lord be blessed.

“Your's *in æternum*, as I hope,

“21^o. Apr.

“H. G.

“I thought verily my chamber in Thames Street had been given over, and, therefore, I used it to save Erith; but I might have done otherwise.”³

¹ Jardine, ii. 330.

² See them in Jardine, ii. 331.

³ State Paper Office; Jardine, ii. 332. The words from James, c. v. 11, are in Latin.

At the end of the letter Garnet described an oval figure, the cross at the top, the I. H. S., or *Jesus Hominum Salvator*, Jesus Saviour of Men, in the centre, with the figure of a heart beneath, pierced with three nails, and the following words below : God of my heart, and my portion God for ever, *Deus cordis mei ; et pars mea Deus in æternum*.

Still they tormented him ; and gave him another examination on the 25th of April ; and after a dismal interval of eight days, the Jesuit was finally informed that he was to suffer the death. The wretched man could hardly be persuaded to believe the announcement, “having conceived great hope of grace by some good words and promises he said were made to him,”—thus did they deceive him to the last.¹ On the 3rd of May, 1606, Garnet was drawn upon a hurdle, according to the usual practice, to the place of execution prepared in St. Paul’s Churchyard. The Recorder of London, the Dean of St. Paul’s, and the Dean of Winchester, were present by the king’s command—the first in the king’s name, and the two others in the name of God and Christ—to assist the Jesuit with such advice as suited the condition of a dying man.² And how did they fulfil their mission ? Oh, ’twas a bitter thing to hear these *Christians* squabbling, (no other words will do), squabbling with the wretched Jesuit on the brink of eternity ! High aloft above the heads of the multitude assembled to see the sight, the scaffold displayed the Jesuit, the Man of the Law, and the Men of God. The man of the law urged the Jesuit publicly to declare his real opinion respecting the conspiracy and treason—“it

¹ A letter at the State Paper Office, Jardine, ii. 334.

² Jardine, ii. 337.

was now of no use to dissemble—all was clearly and manifestly proved,”—and the Man of the Law ventured to mention “the true spirit of repentance” and satisfaction to “the Christian world,” with “hearty compunction.” And the deans said they were there “to suggest to him such matters as might be useful for his soul,”—they exhorted him “to prepare and settle himself for another world.” The Jesuit intimated that he was ready. The Churchmen asked him to declare his mind to the people. He denounced the plot to those beside him. They would have him declare as much to the multitude. “I am very weak,” said he ; “my voice fails me : if I should speak to the people, I cannot make them hear me ; it is impossible that they should hear me.” They led him to the western end of the scaffold. Still he hesitated to address the people. The recorder urged him, and promised to repeat his words aloud to the multitude. Then he addressed the multitude as follows : “My good fellow-citizens, I am come hither on the morrow of the invention of the Holy Cross, to see an end of all my pains and troubles in this world ; and I here declare before you all, that I consider the late treason and conspiracy against the state, to be cruel and detestable : and, for my part, all designs and endeavours against the king were ever disliked by me ; and if this attempt had been perfected as it was designed, I think it would have been altogether damnable : and I pray for all prosperity to the king, the queen, and the royal family.” He paused. The recorder told him to “ask pardon of the king for what he had attempted.” “I do so,” said Garnet, “as far as I have sinned against him,—namely, in that I did not reveal that whereof I had a general knowledge from Mr. Catesby—but not

otherwise." Then the Dean of Winchester began : " Mr. Garnet, I pray you deal clearly in this matter ; you were certainly privy to the whole business." " God forbid ! " said the Jesuit : " I never understood anything of the design of blowing up the Parliament House." Then proceeded the awful squabble between the man of the law, the man of God, and the wretched convict just about to depart for an eternal judgment. It was a repetition of the trial : only the Dean of Winchester was the attorney for the nonce. Charges were flung at the Jesuit, and he flung them back, just as before. Then the recorder interposed, holding in his hand papers which the king had given him for the purpose—as the whole disgraceful scene was planned beforehand : " the king had expressly arranged this, in order that if Garnet, with his accustomed effrontery, should, after all his previous confessions, return to a denial of his guilt, on the scaffold, the means of convicting him by his own testimony might be ready."¹ As soon as the recorder began to produce the papers, Garnet, unwilling to have his confessions publicly read, told him " that he might spare himself that trouble ; that he readily acknowledged whatever he had signed with his hand to be true ; and that, inasmuch as he had not declared the knowledge of the plot which had been generally imparted to him, he owned himself to be justly condemned, and asked pardon of the king." Again he denounced the plot, and the recorder repeated his words with a loud voice to the multitude. And then he remembered Anne Vaux, and proceeded to defend her against the evil reports by which the connection had been tarnished. Having paid this tribute to the faithful Anne, the

¹ Jardine, ii. 341.

wretched convict asked the recorder how much time would be given to him for prayer : he was told that he might pray as long as he liked, and no one would interrupt him. “He then kneeled down at the foot of the ladder, but performed his devotions very coldly, and seemed unable to apply himself steadily and piously to prayer. Indeed, so little affected was he in praying, that he looked round from time to time, and listened to what was said by the attendants, sometimes even answering to what they said ; so that he seemed to mutter his prayers more for form and appearance than from any devotion of mind.” When he arose from his knees, and was about to put off his clothes, the recorder *again* addressed him, saying, “That he feared he was about to make his end as his life had been,—his main object being still to attempt to extenuate his crime by cunning and duplicity.” One of those standing near him then asked him, “Whether he still held the same opinion as he had formerly expressed about equivocation, and whether he thought it lawful to equivocate at the point of death ?” He refused to give an opinion at that time ; and the Dean of St. Paul’s sharply inveighing against equivocation, and saying that seditious doctrine of that kind was the parent of all such impious treasons and designs as those for which he suffered, Garnet said, “that how equivocation was lawful, and, when [lawful], he had shewn his mind elsewhere, and that he should, at any rate, use no equivocation now.” The dean rejoined ; “But you have recorded strange doctrines on that subject in your written confessions.” “In those confessions,” said Garnet, “I have stated my real opinions, and to them I refer you.” The recorder then assured him, as he seemed still to entertain some

hope of life, "That there was now no hope of pardon for him, and that it therefore behoved him to declare any thing within his knowledge, which might be useful to the state ; and at all events, that it was desirable that he should declare to the people whether he was satisfied of the justice of his condemnation." Garnet answered, that he had nothing further to confess, but that he was esteemed more guilty than he really was, inasmuch as he was not the author or contriver of the plot. When he had undressed himself to his shirt, he said, with a low voice to those who stood nearest to him, "There is no salvation for you, unless you hold the Catholic faith." They answered, "We doubt not that we do hold the Catholic faith." "But," said he, "the only Catholic faith is that professed by the Church of Rome." They replied, "that upon this matter he was altogether in error." He then ascended the ladder, and, when he had entirely undressed himself, he requested the executioner to give him notice before he threw him off ;—and thereupon he addressed the people of his own accord :—"I commend myself to all good Catholics. I am grieved that I have offended the king by not revealing the design entertained against him, and that I did not use more diligence in preventing the execution of the plot. Moreover, I pray God to bless the king's majesty, with the queen, and all their posterity, and grant him long to live and reign. I commend myself also most humbly to the lords of his majesty's council, and beseech them not to judge hardly of me. I am sorry that I dissembled with them, and that I did not declare the truth until it was proved against me ; but I did not think they had such sure proofs against me till they showed them to me. As soon as

I perceived this, I thought it most becoming to confess, although before, it would have been unlawful for me to have accused myself. As to my brother Greenway, I wish the truth respecting him were known. I would never have charged him, if I had not believed him to be beyond the sea. But it seemed right to me to confess the truth, which I wish he had done also, that false rumours might not make both of us more criminal than we really were. I beseech all men that Catholics may not fare the worse for my sake, and I exhort all Catholics to take care not to mix themselves with seditious or traitorous designs against the king." Having thus spoken, he raised his hands and made the sign of the cross upon his forehead and breast, saying in Latin, "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost! Jesus Mary! Mary, mother of grace! mother of mercy! Do thou defend me from the enemy, and receive me in the hour of death." Then he said:—"Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit, because thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth!" Then again crossing himself, he continued in Latin still,—“By this sign of the cross, may all that is malignant flee far from me! Plant thy cross, O Lord, in my heart”—and again, “Jesus Mary! Mary, mother of grace! mother of mercy! Do thou defend me from the enemy, and receive me in the hour of death!” In the midst of these prayers the ladder was drawn away, and, by the express command of the king, he remained hanging from the gallows until he was quite dead.¹

¹ Jardine, ii. 341—344, quoting Abbott. I need not state that Bartoli and More, the Jesuit-historians of the English province, give a more edifying death-scene to Garnet;—but from all that preceded, I prefer that of an enemy, as being much more probable in the given circumstances. More gives Garnet a

The account from which I have quoted proceeds with the remark that, "all that Garnet said from first to last was spoken in a hurried, timid, and disturbed manner ; not using any clear and steady course of prayer, not confessing his unworthiness, and praying for forgiveness, nor professing his faith in Christ. His mind appeared to suggest nothing to him which could enable him to address himself to God with comfort, or rely with satisfaction upon his Redeemer. Confiding wholly in his superstitious usages, he seemed to have no prayers to use besides those forms which daily repetition had impressed upon his memory."¹ All this may be perfectly true ; but consider the incessant harassing repetitions of the charges with which the man of the law, and the men of God, literally pelted the wretched convict. Tempting him to the very brink of eternity, they denied him the power, if he had the will, to die in peace with his Maker ; and then he is charged, nay, condemned for not dying a death more edifying than the life which to its last moment they compelled him to live ! In truth, the trial of Garnet develops Jesuitism ; but perhaps it still more strikingly exhibits the Jesuitism of the Scoto-English government under its Solomon ;

speech, but it does not contain all that was elsewhere recorded as having been uttered by the Jesuit. The important feature of the speech, which induces me to think it authentic in substance, is Garnet's last effort to explain away the bad impressions, which he had been given to believe, the Catholics entertained respecting his disclosures. Besides, there is an important false statement in More and Bartoli. The king's express command was that Garnet should remain hanging from the gallows until he was quite dead :—but Bartoli actually says that the executioner cut off Garnet's head, closed the eyes, shut the lips, and held it up to the people—but none cried "Long live the king !" but a profound silence reigned around (*Dell' Inghil.* f. 579) :—whilst More says that "the populace by their cries, deterred the executioner from cutting the rope too soon, shouting again and again : 'Keep off ! keep off ! Let him hang to the last breath !' "—*Butler*, ii. 158.

¹ *Jardine*, ii. 344.

and I hesitate not to affirm, that those with whom he had to deal, from first to last, do not seem to me more respectable as Christians, or as men, than the Jesuit. I see ample evidence to suggest the moral guilt of Garnet, as well as his legal guilt by his own admission, of the treason for which he suffered : but the means employed to eventuate the conviction of the wretch, or rather to justify his execution to the world, were so detestable, so mean, so cruel, that it would almost seem that some malignant fiend resolved to make that trial compensate for the horrible but averted guilt of the Powder Action. The disgrace which should have been confined to a few disreputable, desperate men calling themselves Catholics, and connected with the Jesuit faction in England, has settled also upon the Protestant party, who covered themselves with the infamy we have traced to its conclusion. It is well to be reminded of these facts, as often as the 5th of November comes round with its riots and damages, as though the fiend aforesaid made the Powder Action a legacy of inflictions on the loyal people of England, to the latest posterity.

A few remarks on this celebrated trial may be interesting. The conviction of Garnet, and his consequent punishment, were not the object of the trial. The end proposed by the clever heads of those times, was to make "a public and visible anatomy of Popish doctrine and practice," as the Earl of Salisbury declared on the trial. The ferocious and hungry party in power, eagerly grasped the occasion to establish, on some sort of principle, the severe enactments which they had prepared against the Catholics. With this intention, the particular crime of Garnet was expanded into a large discourse of all the treasons, real and imputed, of the

faction. Garnet's affair was the text; but all the villanous attempts of Cullen, Williams, Yorke, and Squires, in the reign of Elizabeth, were detailed at great length, and urged upon the attention of the jury, with every circumstance of aggravation. Nor did the interested prosecutors confine themselves, in the case of the culprit, to the particular crime in question, but, in order to excite a particular prejudice against Garnet, they entered into the history of the treasonable negotiation of the Jesuit faction with the King of Spain, at the end of Elizabeth's reign—promoted or forwarded by Garnet, as I have related. This machination was recited and proved as circumstantially as if it had been part of the charge in the indictment—although Garnet had, at the accession of James, *purchased* his pardon from the king, for all previous misdemeanors.¹ “The course of examination and evidence,” says Jardine, “as well as the general conduct of the trial, corresponded with the practice at that time universally adopted in state prosecutions. The whole evidence against Garnet, as to the Powder

¹ It must, however, be borne in mind that the Spanish faction continued in full activity for some time after the accession of James. In 1603, an emissary was accredited to the Spanish court, was furnished with letters of recommendation from Garnet to the Jesuit Creswell, and was secretly instructed to deal with Philip III. or his council for a renewal of the engagements made with Winter, on the former occasion. *Fawkes* was dispatched on the same expedition, and he was introduced by letters from Baldwin, a Jesuit resident in Flanders: “he was enabled to enforce his reasonings with a description of the preparations already made in England, for the assistance of an invading army,” says Mr. Tierney. Philip received the messengers kindly, but refused to adopt their proposals. He said he had no quarrel with his English brother: he had already appointed an ambassador to adjust the terms of a lasting peace with James: it was thus impossible for him to listen to the representations of the two envoys—though accredited by the Jesuits Garnet and Baldwin. This was the death-blow to the Spanish faction; the idea of invasion sank for ever; and the grim ghost or fiend of the Powder Action emerged from the agitated gulf of despair.—See *Tierney*, iv. p. 3, note. See also *Watson's statement*, *ante*, p. 154, note.

Plot, consisted of his own voluntary statements and declarations before the commissioners, and of the confessions of those who had been already executed for the offence with which he was charged ; and no single living witness was produced in the course of this voluminous proceeding, excepting the two persons who verified the interlocutions of Garnet with Hall. With respect to the mode of laying these documents before the jury, a more than usual unfairness took place on this trial, in the selection of passages to be read from the examinations and confessions. Among many instances of a similar kind, an example of peculiar injustice in this respect occurs in the case of a voluntary declaration of Garnet, dated the 13th of March, which follows in the form in which it was read upon the trial. A better illustration of this iniquitous course of proceeding can hardly be found ; and I therefore now give the reader the whole declaration from the original, premising that the body of the paper is entirely written by Garnet ; but that the letters in the margin, distinguishing the paragraphs, and those at the head of the paper, pointing out to the officer what he was to read, are in Sir Edward Coke's handwriting. The passages read on the trial are distinguished by italics :—

| | | |
|----|---|------------------------|
| A. | } | Paragraphs to be read. |
| B. | | |
| D. | | |
| F. | | |

“ 13o Martii.

A. “ *I have remembered some things, which, because they were long before my knowledge of the Powder Acts, I had forgotten.*

B. “ *About Michaelmas after the king came in, Mr.*

Fac Simile
of the Autograph of Parsons
The English Jesuit

praying you to be careful to do so, but in this point
and to admire me thereof & did you hardly for will
x 1603 20th 24th May 1612

R. Parsons

Catesby told me that there would be some stirring, seeing the king kept not promise.

C. "And I greatly misliked it, saying it was against the pope's express commandment ; for I had a letter from our general thereof, dated in July before, wherein was earnestly, by Clement, commanded the very same which this pope commanded the last summer. Therefore, I earnestly desired him that he and Mr. Thomas Winter would not join with any in such tumults : for, in respect of their often conversation with us, we should be thought accessory. He assured me he would not. But neither he told, nor I asked, any particulars.

D. "*Long after this, about Midsummer was twelve-month, either Mr. Catesby alone, or he and Thomas Winter together, insinuated that they had somewhat in hand, and that they would sure prevail.*

E. "I still reprov'd them ; but they entered into no particulars.

F. "*Soon after came Mr. Greenwell [Greenway, the Jesuit Tesmond] to me, and told me as much.*

G. "I greatly misliked any stirring, and said, 'Good Lord ! how is it possible that God can work any good effect by these men ? These are not God's knights, but the devil's knights.' Mr. Greenwell told this to Thomas Winter, who, about a month after Michaelmas, came to me, and expostulated that I had so hard a conceit of him, and would never tell him of it. As for their intermeddling in matters of tumults, since I misliked it, he promised they would give over ; and I never heard more of it until the question propounded by Mr. Catesby.¹

¹ This was a question which Catesby proposed to Garnet "in general terms, as to the lawfulness of a design intended for the promotion of the Catholic

As for his asking me of the lawfulness of killing the king, I am sure it was never asked me in my life, and I was always resolute that it was not lawful ; but he was so resolved in conscience, that it was lawful in itself to take arms for religion, that no man could dissuade it, but by the pope's prohibition, which afterwards I

religion, in the prosecution of which, it would be necessary, together with many enemies, to destroy some innocent Catholic friends." Garnet said that in total ignorance of Catesby's intended application of his answer, he replied, that " in case the object was clearly good, and could be effected by no other means, it might be lawful among many nocents to destroy some innocents."—*Garnet's Examin. Jardine*, ii. 229. By thus expressly connecting this question with the plot, Garnet evidently contradicts the assertion of Greenway or the Jesuit *Tesmond*, who, in *his* Narrative, would make it appear that Catesby's question referred to his pretended design of serving under the Archduke in Flanders against the States. The particular case being the attack on a town defended by Dutch heretics, in sacking which it might happen that some Catholic inhabitants might be killed or injured ;—the question was whether it was justifiable to prosecute a design in which this injustice might probably occur ? Garnet answered in the affirmative.—*Ibid.* In point of fact, throughout the whole machination, the Jesuits seem to have known everything, and yet in such a way that they could *casuistically*, *equivocatingly* say they knew nothing of the transaction. So strangely did they deceive themselves by casuistry. I may observe that this same question occurs in the casuistic works of the Jesuit Lessius, and is repeated by *Ligorio*, iii. 121. Perhaps one of the most remarkable facts connected with this affair, is, that the Jesuit Martin Delrius, in his *Disquisitiones Magicae*, published in 1600, two or three years before the scheme was concocted, actually gives a gunpowder plot in *illustration* : " For instance," says he, " a criminal confesses that he or some other person has placed gunpowder or other combustible matter under a certain house ; and that unless this is removed, the house will inevitably be blown up, the king killed, and as many as go into or out of the city be destroyed or brought into great danger,—in such a case, almost all the learned doctors, with few exceptions, assert that the confessor may reveal it, if he take due care that, neither directly nor indirectly, he draws into suspicion the particular offence of the person confessing. But the contrary opinion is the safer and better doctrine, and more consistent with religion, and with the reverence due to the holy rite of confession." See the whole passage in *Jardine*, ii. 371, 372, with some sensible remarks thereon, showing that the work might be in the hands of the English Catholics, or rather, their leaders. I shall have occasion to offer a few observations on the practice of confession, in general, and will only here remind the reader of the Irish ostler who, upon being asked by his confessor whether he ever greased the horses' teeth, said " No—but he would try it."

inculcated, as I have said before. The ground of this his resolute opinion I will think of.

“HENRY GARNET.”

“It is clear,” says Jardine, “that the whole of this declaration, taken together, would have been far too favourable to Garnet to be consistent with the case which the attorney-general meant to lay before the jury. He therefore made no scruple to read parts of it, as unqualified admissions of Garnet’s conferences with Catesby and Winter about intended tumults, and to omit altogether the statement by which these admissions were qualified and restricted; namely, that on such occasions he invariably discouraged seditious movements to the utmost of his power. This mode of dealing with the admission of an accused person is pure and unmixed injustice; it is, in truth, a forgery of evidence; for when a qualified statement is made, the suppression of the qualification is no less a forgery than if the whole statement had been fabricated.¹”

“In many other respects, this trial of Garnet forms a peculiar illustration of the cruelty and injustice of a state prosecution in ancient times; and indeed in those evil days of the administration of justice, few men came to their trial under greater disadvantages than Garnet. He had been examined twenty-three times, as he states, ‘before the wisest of the realm,’ besides sundry conferences with the Lieutenant of the Tower, which were all recorded against him with ready zeal. The king’s humanity, or perhaps his timidity, had indeed saved him

¹ “This practice of falsifying the confessions of accused persons appears to have prevailed to a most unjust extent in the *ore tenus* proceedings in the Star Chamber, and may have been thence derived into state prosecutions in other courts.”—*Jardine*, ii. 358.

from actual torture ; but the rack had been threatened by the commissioners, and it appears from his letters that he was constantly in fear of it. He had literally been surrounded by snares ; his confidential conferences with his friend had been insidiously overheard, and, as he said, misunderstood ; and it is obvious that the listeners did not hear all, or nearly all that passed. His letters from the Tower had been intercepted, and were in the possession of his accusers, and artifices and threats were alternately employed in order to delude or terrify him into confession. After six weeks' imprisonment, with a weak and decaying body, and with spirits broken by perpetual alarm and anxiety, he was suddenly taken from the solitude of his dungeon, to contend for his life, alone and unassisted, before a crowd of prejudiced and partial auditors, against the most subtle advocate of the time. When these disadvantages are duly considered, it must be confessed that Garnet played his part on the trial with firmness and moderation ; answering sedately and respectfully to the searching questions proposed by the commissioners, and steadily maintaining the ground upon which he had rested his defence, ever since the discoveries induced by means of his conferences with Oldcorne. We search in vain, however, in his demeanour on the trial, as well as in his various letters and examinations, for proofs of that intelligence and learning which are ascribed to him by Bellarmine and other writers of his own party.”¹

The general question of Garnet's *moral* guilt has been the subject of warm discussion at various times during the last two centuries. Those who have debated this matter *since* the trial, observes Jardine, have undoubtedly

¹ Jardine, ii. 355—360.

far better means of forming an accurate judgment upon it, than the court or jury upon the trial, in consequence of the important evidence obtained by means of Garnet's confessions after the close of the judicial proceedings. In the course of the year after Garnet's execution the question arose incidentally in the course of the controversy respecting the new oath of allegiance imposed by James. The king, in his "Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance," asserted that Garnet, "the leader of the band of Jesuits in England," had died, acknowledging his privity to the plot by other means than sacramental confession ;—this was indignantly contradicted by Bellarmine, who, under the assumed name of Matthæus Tortus, published an answer to the king's "Apologie." Launcelot Andrews, Bishop of Chichester, replied to this work of Bellarmine by an extremely acute and powerful pamphlet, entitled, "Tortura Torti," in which the question respecting the manner and extent of Garnet's acquaintance with the plot is fully and ably argued. James also noticed Bellarmine's work in a "Præmonition to all Christian Princes," prefixed to a revised edition of his "Apologie." Upon this Bellarmine wrote an "Apologie for his Answer to the Book of King James I.," in which he re-asserted Garnet's innocence of any criminal participation in the plot. In the year 1610 a work appeared, entitled "An Apology for the most Reverend Father Henry Garnet against the charge of Sir Henry Coke," written by a person who assumed the name of Eudæmon Joannes, and described himself as a Cretan Jesuit ; but who was supposed by contemporaries to be one of the expatriated English missionaries. It is, however, sufficiently ascertained that the real name of the author of the several works published under the title

of Eudæmon Joannes was L'Heureux. He was a native of Candia, and a Jesuit of high reputation for learning, who taught theology at the University of Padua, and was appointed by Pope Urban VIII. Rector of the Greek College at Rome. The book of Eudæmon Joannes was adroitly and plausibly written, and excited so strong a sensation throughout Europe in favour of Garnet, that James considered it absolutely necessary to provide some antidote to the poison. He therefore employed the celebrated Isaac Casaubon, whom he had about that time invited to England, to refute the Jesuit's arguments, and supplied him with all the confessions and declarations of the conspirators, and of Garnet himself, together with various other documents necessary for the purpose. Casaubon executed the duty imposed upon him with a degree of skill and candour worthy of his enlightened character ; and his "Epistle to Fronto Duçæus," which appeared in 1611, is unquestionably one of the best works which were published on the subject. Eudæmon Joannes, in 1612, wrote an answer to Casaubon, by no means equal to his first work, and easily to be refuted by those who had access to the evidence possessed by the English government. Still the impression produced upon the public mind by the arguments of Eudæmon Joannes in his first work, was not entirely removed : Catholic writers continued to refer to it as a triumphant and incontrovertible demonstration of Garnet's innocence ; while the inaccurate and imperfect narration of the proceedings on his trial, led to abundant false reasoning upon the subject. In this state of the controversy, Dr. Robert Abbott, the brother of the Archbishop of Canterbury, a man of the highest reputation for talents and learning, but a fierce adversary of popery, and, from his

controversies with Bellarmine and the Arminians, denominated—" *Malleus Papismi et Arminianismi*, published his celebrated ' *Antilogia adversus Apologiam Andreæ Eudæmon Joannis.*'" In consequence of the vast body of evidence it contains, drawn from the original materials supplied by the government, as well as the powerful reasoning of the author, it is, beyond all comparison, the most important work which appeared in the course of the controversy. It abounds in the scurrilous language so common in the political and religious disputes of that time, and contains incredible stories of Garnet's personal immoralities; but it is peculiarly valuable at the present day, in assisting us to form an accurate judgment upon the main subject of the controversy, because it gives the substance of much documentary evidence not now to be found, and removes many doubts, and fills up many chasms in the history of the transaction. In 1678 the celebrated Popish Plot again excited a fierce controversy between the Catholics and Protestants. In more recent times, the great question of Catholic emancipation once more raised up the spirit of controversy respecting Garnet, and his connexion with the Powder Plot, and Mr. Butler's remarks on the subject in his " *Memoirs of the English Catholics*," which, though partial and superficial in the extreme, had, at least, the merit of being temperate, called forth warm and animated replies from Mr. Townsend, and various other writers of less eminence and ability. Violent party spirit, stimulated by the peculiar circumstances of the periods in which the debates have arisen, —and the very imperfect knowledge of facts upon which the arguments on both sides have generally proceeded—these two causes have invariably mystified the

subject, and impeded the successful investigation of the truth. Party spirit and prejudice have distorted and misapplied the materials at command; and the discussion has been conducted so much more in the spirit of political rancour than of candid inquiry, that the only result has been to widen the unfortunate breach which had so long existed between the Catholic and the Protestant, without advancing a step towards the solution of the historical difficulties: "It is most absurd and unjust," observes Jardine, "to argue, because a particular Jesuit, two hundred years ago, followed his pernicious principles into a wicked course of action, that therefore the principles and doctrines of Catholics at the present day must be practically opposed to morality and good government. Garnet's most obnoxious and dangerous opinions were the opinions of a section only of those who professed the Roman Catholic religion: they were not sanctioned generally even by the Jesuits of his day, but were maintained and encouraged only by the most fanatical and extravagant casuists of that party. In the writings of several learned Jesuits in the seventeenth century, there are no traces of such extreme opinions; within fifty years after Garnet's time, they were ridiculed and refuted in the *Lettres Provinciales* of Pascal, who was a conscientious Catholic; they were disclaimed as doctrines of the Church of Rome, in the most solemn manner, by the unfortunate Lord Stafford, who was also a conscientious Catholic; and in the doctrinal works of Catholic divines in our own times they are universally disavowed and condemned. If it be unfair and unreasonable to impute to modern Catholics the false and mischievous *opinions* of Garnet, it is still more manifestly unjust to make them responsible for his *particular*

crimes, unless it could be shown that they entertain his opinions, and also that such crimes are their natural and probable result.”¹

With regard to the moral guilt of Garnet, there are circumstances of peculiar obdurateness in his conduct, after he became acquainted with the atrocious design. On the 4th of September, before the horrible affair was to come off, Garnet wrote a letter to Parsons, doubtless intended for exhibition to Aquaviva and the pope, in which he said :—“ As far as I can now see, *the minds of the Catholics are quieted, and they are now determined to bear with patience the troubles of persecution for the time to come ; not, indeed, without hope that either the king himself, or, at least, his son, will grant some relief to their oppressions.*” His Jesuit apologist—who could know nothing of what Garnet had confessed, excepting what appeared from the imperfect report of his trial, alleged the above announcement as a proof that Garnet was ignorant of the plot at the time it was written. But Garnet admitted, in his confession, that for many months

¹ Jardine, ii. 364—370. Mr. Jardine is scarcely correct in saying that the doctrines put forth by Garnet “are universally disavowed and condemned in the doctrinal works of Catholic divines in our times.” By referring to the last edition of *Ligorio*, 1845, t. ii. p. 316—327, it will be evident that the old theory of amphibology or equivocation, &c., is still taught by the casuists ; in fact, *Ligorio* invariably quotes the Jesuits as men of authority. The equivocation deduced from the words of Christ, before given, is in *Ligorio*, and the whole section is as full of convenient distinctions and cases as can possibly be required. But this cannot bear on the question of Catholic rights, and perfect equality. By proscription we give power and influence to their priesthood, and open a way to the worst doctrines of the casuists. The great body of Catholics know nothing at all of these doctrines : they are confined to the *priests*. It should therefore be the object of governments to disconnect the people from the priests. This result is daily more and more apparent. I believe that perfect toleration will be the death-blow to the influence of the Roman priesthood. I speak in general terms—for undoubtedly there are amongst that body at the present day, men of unexceptionable probity.

before that date, he was made acquainted with the plot by Greenway—that he was fully aware of the perseverance of the conspirators in their scheme, as he asked Greenway about it as often as he saw him—and, at the moment he wrote that letter, he was on the point of starting upon a pilgrimage with several of the sworn conspirators, to St. Winifred's Well, in Flintshire.¹ This letter must be considered as supplying convincing and fatal evidence against Garnet. It shows to demonstration that, within a few weeks before the intended meeting of Parliament, when the blow was to be struck, Garnet was wilfully deceiving, *not Parsons*, indeed, as Jardine says, but the general and the pope, as to the disposition of the English Catholics ; and that, so far from endeavouring to procure a prohibition from the pope to prevent the execution of the plot, he was persuading the authorities at Rome into a belief that all interference on their part

¹ In the month of September, 1605, this pilgrimage was undertaken by Garnet, accompanied by a large party of Catholics. The performance of this extraordinary religious ceremony, at this precise point of time, when the Parliament was expected to meet on the ensuing 3rd of October, and the Powder Plot was on the eve of its execution, is undoubtedly a circumstance entitled to much weight in considering the question of Garnet's implication in the *moral* guilt of the conspiracy. It appears, from various examinations, that the party consisted of about thirty persons, male and female, among whom were Garnet, Anne Vaux, and Lady Digby. The pilgrimage, which occupied about a fortnight, began at Goathurst, *Sir Everard Digby's* house, in Buckinghamshire, and proceeded by Davenport to *John Grant's* house at Norbrook, and *Winter's* at Haddington, and thence through Shrewsbury to Holt, in Flintshire. It is material to observe not only that Rookwood, one of the avowed conspirators, was a party to this pilgrimage, but that on their progress the pilgrims stopped at the houses of Grant and Winter, at each of which mass was said by Garnet. "It is scarcely conceivable," observes Jardine, "that this unusual proceeding, undertaken at the express suggestion of Garnet, by persons actively concerned in the plot, within a month from its proposed execution, should not have had reference to the great blow then about to be struck for the Catholic Church." If this step may seem to change the horrible crime into infatuated fanaticism, it may also have been the means adopted to impress the minds of the vulgar with the notion that God willed the deed of blood, and thus replied to their prayers.

had become unnecessary, and that all previous representations to the contrary (if such were ever made) were to be considered as withdrawn. He might be bound, if his story were true, by a supposed religious duty, not to reveal the *particular* scheme ; but no motive but a desire to promote the purposes of the conspirators, by absolutely preventing any interference from Rome, could have led him thus to suggest a falsehood—"to speak peace when there was no peace,"—to talk of the patience and quietness of the Catholics, and of their hopes from the king and his son, when he knew that, within two months from the date of his letter, a party among them, in the rage of despair, were about to execute upon the king and the Protestant party the most savage vengeance which the heart of man ever devised.¹ Even the friends and apologists of Garnet admit that he was apprised of the dreadful scheme about the 21st of October ; and yet, in a letter of his, whose postscript bears that date, there is actually nothing whatever to indicate that perturbed state of mind which he pretended to experience from the first intimation of the Powder Action. True, after describing the sufferings of the Catholics, and stating the royal threat of greater severities, he says :—"And yet, notwithstanding, I am assured that the best sort of Catholics will bear all their losses with patience : but how these tyrannical proceedings of such base officers may drive particular men to desperate attempts, that I cannot answer for :—the king's wisdom will foresee :"—but the body of the letter consists of topics and suggestions totally incompatible with the presence of any dreadful thought in the mind of the writer. I have quoted from the letter in a previous page, and will now give other extracts :—

¹ Jardine, ii. 384—386.

“ Father Stanny, the Jesuit, is now very well in the Gatehouse, though close : yet it is thought he shall go over, at the French ambassador’s request ; to which ambassador we are all beholden : and the suit cometh of the ambassador’s self. This Father Stanny hath written of himself, that he was sorely tormented with the stone, and had also the measles ; and, for want of sleep, fell into the conceit [that] the house where he was should be searched : therefore, went out, for fear of hurting the family, came to an inn, where, having not slept, in the morning, *he imagined the town was all in armour, betwixt Catholics and heretics*, and so *thought he must also do his part, and so called for a knife, and struck the chamberlain.*¹ He hath been diversely examined ; but all is well ended, and rather edification taken of all sorts, than otherwise ; and Catholics esteem of him as of a saint, as, indeed, his carriage for these twenty years hath deserved.

“ I forgot to write again the jest which once I wrote in the letter which was missent to Joseph [probably Joseph Creswell, the Jesuit], which he returned to me very unluckily ; that is, that Father Parsons [having] procured Mr. Thomas Fitzherbert to be the pope’s secretary, exacted, first, an oath, that Mr. Fitzherbert should discover all the secrets ; which oath prevailing against the other second oath, taken to the pope himself, divers secrets were known, which Clement knew must needs be discovered by his secretary, Fitzherbert, who, either by torture, or for fear of the same, disclosed his former oath to Father Parsons, who thereupon fled to

¹ This extraordinary hallucination of the Jesuit is certainly remarkable at the time when the Powder Action and its probable results were the dominant ideas of those who reasoned in their madness.

Naples. This I write, to make you sport : but Mr. Christopher Southworth most confidently reported it.¹

These were scarcely topics to be enlarged upon by one, who contemplated with any kind of horror, the frightful machination with which he was acquainted. Now this letter is one of the strong points with the Jesuit and other apologists of Garnet. Mr. Tierney observes : “ Relying on the fidelity of Gerard, the Jesuit, who declares ‘*upon his conscience*,’ that he has ‘set down Father Garnet’s words truly and sincerely as they lie in his letter,’ Dr. Lingard has printed what is given by that writer, and from it has argued with Greenway, that Garnet, on the *fourth* of October, the date assigned to it both by Gerard and Greenway, was still ignorant of the nature of the plot. The truth, however, is, that although the *letter* was written on the *fourth*, the *postscript* was not added until the *twenty-first*, of October : that from this postscript the two Jesuit writers have selected a sentence, which they have transferred to the body of the letter ; and then, concealing both the existence of the postscript, and the date of the twenty-first, have represented the whole as written and dispatched on the fourth. The motive for this proceeding, especially on the part of Greenway, is obvious. That writer’s argument is, that the Parliament had been summoned to meet on the third of October ; that Garnet had not heard of the intention to prorogue it to the following month (this, to say the least, is very improbable) ; that, for any thing he could have known to the contrary, the great blow had already been struck, at the very time when he was writing ; and, consequently, that had he been acquainted with the intentions of Catesby and his

¹ MS. apud Tierney, iv. Append. civ. *et seq.*

confederates, he would never, at such a moment, have thought of proceeding, as he says [in the letter] he was about to proceed, towards London, and thus exposing himself to the almost inevitable danger of falling into the hands of his enemies. Now, the whole of this reasoning is founded on the assumption that the letter bore only the single date of the fourth. On the twenty-first, the supposed danger of a journey to London no longer existed. At that period, too, Garnet, instead of proceeding towards the metropolis, had not only removed in the opposite direction,—from Goathurst, in Buckinghamshire, to Harrowden, the seat of Lord Vaux, in Northamptonshire, but was also preparing to withdraw himself still farther from the capital, and by the end of the month, was actually at Coughton, in the neighbourhood of Alcester. In fact, what was written on the fourth, he had practically contradicted on the twenty-first : and to have allowed any part of the letter, therefore, to carry this later date, would have been to supply the refutation of the very argument which it was intended to support. Hence the expedient to which this writer has had recourse. The postscript and its date are carefully suppressed ; and we are told that, looking at the contents of the letter, Garnet, when he wrote it, could have known nothing of the designs of the conspirators :—‘ When he wrote this letter [says Greenway], which was on the 4th of October, he knew nothing of the project of these gentlemen, other than by the suspicion which he had at first entertained.’ Without stopping to notice the falsehood contained in the concluding words of this sentence, and without intending to offer an opinion here, as to the principal question of Garnet’s conduct, I may still remark that even the friends of that Jesuit universally admit him to

have received the details of the plot from Greenway about the twenty-first ; and that this fact alone may be regarded as supplying another and a sufficient motive both to the latter and to Gerard, for the suppression of that date.”¹ It is in the selfsame letter that, according to Mr. Tierney, there is, “*a short but separate paragraph of three lines carefully obliterated;*” and in the postscript, Garnet says : “This letter being returned unto me again, for reason of a friend’s stay in the way, I blotted out some words, purposing to write the same by the next opportunity, as I will do apart.”² It is true that the paragraph before the erasure, only talks of one of his temporal coadjutors, who “may benefit us by buying and selling without taxes,” and the next treats of his “wonderful distress for the want of the ordinary allowance from Joseph,” the Jesuit Creswell in Spain ;—but when we know, from his own confessions, that he was then aware of the project ; when we consider that the *fourth* of October was just the day after the Parliament was prorogued, the supposition forces itself upon us that this careful erasure of three lines in the letter, covered,

¹ Tierney, *ubi supra*. Mr. Tierney gives a still more striking proof of the utter faithlessness of Gerard. Fawkes stated that Gerard was the Jesuit who administered the communion to the conspirators, but that Gerard was not acquainted with the project. “To show, however,” says Mr. Tierney, “how very little reliance can be placed on the asseverations of Gerard, when employed in his own vindication, it is only right to observe that, referring to this transaction in his manuscript narrative, he first boldly, and very properly, asserts, on the authority of Winter’s confession, that the priest who administered the sacrament was not privy to the designs of the conspirators ; and then, ignorant of Fawkes’s declaration, which had not been published, and supposing that his own name had not transpired, as that of the clergyman who officiated on the occasion, he recurs at once to the artifice which I have elsewhere noticed, of substituting a third person as the narrator, and solemnly protests, on his salvation, that he knows not the priest from whom Catesby and his associates received the communion ! ‘Yet who that priest was I have heard Father Gerard protest, upon his soul and salvation, that he doth not know.’”—*MS.* c. xii. p. 192. See also *Eudæmon Joannes*, 284 ; *Tierney*, iv. 44, note. ² *Ibid.* iv. Append. cvi.

in all probability, the announcement of that important fact to the great paramount of plots and machinations, the ever restless Robert Parsons. Parsons had ever been the very soul of the Spanish faction, and it was out of that broken concern that the Powder Action issued : is it reasonable to believe that Parsons was ignorant of the “ great blow,” about to be struck for the cause ? He who found out—he who knew everything that was passing in England, could never have been ignorant of the Powder Action. If the Jesuit Baldwin, in the Netherlands, was made a party to the scheme, why not Parsons in Italy ? Must Parsons be the soul of every other machination, except the one which seemed so likely to be crowned with complete success ?

These are but conjectures : let us return to the facts attesting Garnet’s moral guilt in the plot. In June, 1605, Catesby proposes to him the question about “ killing nocents and innocents.” One month afterwards, in July, 1605, Greenway, according to Garnet’s account, unfolds the whole scheme of the plot to him, at which communication he says he was struck with horror and grief, and immediately set himself to work to prevent the execution of the project. At this point of time, then, at least, when Greenway made his communications, the meaning of Catesby’s inquiry, about “ nocents and innocents,” which at first Garnet says he thought an idle question, as well as the nature of the plot “ insinuated ” by Catesby or Winter a year before, must have flashed upon his mind. Did his conscience, which became so uneasy upon this discovery that he could not sleep, prompt him to tell Catesby that he now perceived in the insidious question he had propounded—that he now detected the scheme he had in hand ? Did he then denounce the project to him in the epithets he after-

wards applied to it, as being "altogether unlawful and most horrible?" Did he call upon him to abandon the ferocious enterprise, disgraceful to humanity, and an everlasting reproach to his religion? He says, "he could not do this, because it was matter of secret confession." For the reasons above given it may be doubted whether Garnet really believed himself bound by the sacrament of confession;—but admitting that he thought so, it was in his power to relieve himself entirely from this obligation. Catesby, having obtained leave from the other conspirators to do so, offered to inform him in particular what attempt he had in hand, which Garnet refused to hear.¹ Why did he refuse to hear him? His mind was so disquieted with the story that Greenway had told him, that he could not sleep. He earnestly desired—he prayed to God that the project might be prevented—his own tongue, which, if at liberty, might instantly destroy the scheme, was bound by a religious sacrament. Now an opportunity is offered of releasing him from this solemn obligation—and of leaving him altogether free to follow the dictates of humanity and the suggestions of his conscience. He rejects the opportunity! And when Lord Salisbury asks his reason for not hearing Catesby thus offering frankly to tell him the whole story, he answers that "his soul was so troubled with mislike of that particular, that he was loath to hear any more of it." Now, it is plainly impossible that these facts could have existed, as Garnet relates them; for it is beyond all belief that his conduct could have been as it actually was, if his motives and intentions had been as he represents them. A person troubled in spirit by the possession of a frightful

¹ "But I refused to hear him, and at two several times requested him to certify the pope what he intended to do."—*Trial, Jardine*, ii. 293.

secret—painfully anxious to avert an impending calamity by disclosing it, but compelled to silence by a religious obligation—would have eagerly embraced the means of deliverance afforded by Catesby's offer :—Garnet, on the contrary, says he refused it, and gives a frivolous and absurd reason for so doing. His refusal to hear Catesby, under these circumstances, was altogether repugnant to the universal motives which govern the actions of men ; —he gives no sufficient reason for so inconsistent an action ; and therefore, upon the fundamental rules of all historical evidence, the whole story must be rejected as incredible.¹

Again : “ A fortnight before the 5th of November, he is found with Catesby and several Jesuits, at Sir Everard Digby's house at Goathurst [whence he wrote the letter of *two dates*, and the *erasure*, to Parsons]. At this place they separate ;—Catesby going straight to London to execute the bloody project ; and Garnet, with Mrs. Vaux, and Sir Everard and Lady Digby, travelling to Coughton, the centre of the rendezvous—the place actually hired for the purpose of the conspiracy—and whence Digby is to proceed four days afterwards to the pretended hunting at Dunchurch. This journey took place on the 29th of October. At that moment the preparations of the incendiaries were complete. The powder and combustibles were in the cellar. The hand was raised and ready ‘that should have acted that monstrous tragedy.’ Within one week the Parliament would meet, and the catastrophe would take place. Garnet was perfectly informed of all this—the man who abhorred the plot—who, for months before, could not sleep by reason of his alarm—who prayed to God, and did all he could, to prevent the execution of the project

¹ Jardine, ii. 339, *et seq.*

—suffers *Catesby* to depart to the scene of destruction without even a remonstrance, and he himself quietly travels with a principal conspirator to a place hired by that conspirator expressly with a view to the intended operations of the insurgents, after the explosion had taken place. There the insurgents seek Garnet—and thither *Catesby* sends to announce to *Garnet* the failure of the enterprise! All these are admitted facts. Let us now consider for a moment whether this conduct would or could have been the conduct of a person who really felt, thought, and intended, as Garnet declares he did. In the first place, would he have suffered *Catesby* to leave Goathurst on his bloody expedition without remonstrance or warning? Would he, under such circumstances, have removed to a greater distance from London? On the contrary, would not his anxiety have forced him to the scene of immediate action, to take the chance at least of finding some means of averting the blow he so much dreaded? If this was hopeless, would he not at all events have fled to the remotest corner of the land, instead of incurring the suspicions which must necessarily rest upon him, if he sought the rendezvous of these men of blood?"¹

Lastly, "One more instance deserves to be mentioned, in which Garnet's statements appear to be signally refuted by acknowledged facts. Garnet declares that 'he commanded Greenway [the Jesuit Tesmond] to dissuade *Catesby*,' and that 'Greenway said he would do his best to make them desist.'² The calm and temperate manner in which this is represented to have been done, cannot fail to astonish the reader, when he considers the fearful extent and murderous cruelty of the scheme to which the command of Garnet referred. The language is

¹ Jardine, ii. 392, *et seq.*

² Trial, apud Jardine, ii. 294, 302.

precisely that which might have been employed to discourage one of the most insignificant actions of Catesby's daily life, but is surely not such as would have been used to prevent the execution of a design to murder hundreds at a single blow. But, looking to Greenway's conduct, it is wholly incredible either that Greenway promised to urge the conspirators to desist, or that he did in fact do so. Of Greenway's conduct before the 5th of November, we find few particulars recorded, except in Bates's evidence : it is clear, however, that he was in constant communication with the conspirators, and there is no evidence, nor has it been suggested, except in his own exculpatory narrative, that he ever in any degree discouraged the conspiracy. On the other hand, he is found with Garnet at the rendezvous on the day of the meeting of Parliament. On hearing by Bates, after Fawkes's apprehension, that the conspirators are in open rebellion, he goes, after a consultation with Garnet, to join them at Huddington. Catesby and Percy receive him at that place, with open arms, as an associate and ally, the former exclaiming upon his appearance, 'Here is a gentleman that will live and die with us !'¹ After consulting with the arch-traitors for two hours, he rides away to Mr. Abington, at Hendlip, and tells him and his family, that 'unless they presently join the rebels, all their throats will be cut ;' and, upon Mr. Abington's refusal to do so, he rebukes him as a 'phlegmatic' person, and says he shall go elsewhere, and especially into Lancashire, for the same purpose for which he had come to Hendlip.² Here, then, we find the man whom Garnet says he commanded to dissuade the conspirators, intimately allied with them for months before the dis-

¹ Morgan's Examination, 10th Jan., 1605-6. State Paper Office.

² Examination of Hall, or Oldcorne, Mar. 6, 1605-6. State Paper Office.

covery of the treason, and yet doing nothing, in performance of the supposed command of the superior ; nay, upon their breaking out into actual rebellion, he even joins them, rides to and fro in the country to excite Papists to arm in their support, and acts in every respect as a zealous promoter of their design. Can it be believed that Greenway, a subordinate Jesuit, would have dared thus to disobey the positive command of his superior, if such a command had really been issued ? Is it credible that Greenway, who had confessed the plot to Garnet, and received absolution on the express condition of his promise to dissuade others from this great sin, should have not only omitted to do so, but have done all in his power to assist and encourage the traitors to promote the treason ? ”¹

In fact, “ Garnet was the friend of Catesby, Thomas Winter, and Greenway. Garnet had avowedly participated with them in two previous capital treasons, one immediately before, the other immediately after, the death of Queen Elizabeth, which he himself considered so serious, that he thought it necessary to shelter himself from punishment by [purchasing] a pardon [from the king]. He had kept the pope’s breves against Protestant succession for several years, and had repeatedly shown them to Catesby and Winter, the former of whom constantly referred to these breves, as justifying his scheme. Of *Catesby, the contriver of the plot*, Garnet was the peculiar and intimate adviser and associate. At White Webbs, at Erith, at his lodging in Thames-street, at Fremlands, in Moorfields, and at Goathurst, from the time of the king’s accession until within a fortnight of the 5th of November, *Catesby* and *Garnet* are found in constant and confidential communication. *Catesby* informs him repeatedly in general terms

¹ Jardine, ii. 396, *et seq.*

that he had a treason in hand ; and yet—according to Garnet—he who had been his *accomplice* in two previous treasons, does not choose to trust him with the particulars of the third—passes by his friend—the superior of the Jesuits, and confesses his design to Greenway, a subordinate Jesuit ! This strange reserve could not proceed from any apprehension of Garnet's disapprobation of the scheme ; for Garnet declares that Catesby had all along no doubt of its lawfulness—that he knew it would prevail, and that he was sure the pope himself could not but approve it. In truth, no cause ever has, or ever can, be assigned for this improbable and unnatural silence : it is inconsistent with the character and relative position of the parties—it is contrary to the common motives which actuate the conduct of mankind ; and, if the facts above stated respecting the intimate connexion between Garnet and Catesby be true, it is absolutely incredible.”¹

I believe that this acute and most candid reasoning of Jardine, decides the moral guilt of the Jesuit. This admirable writer brings forward other striking and acknowledged facts to strengthen this position, all in accordance with the axiom of Lord Stowell, the profound master of the science and practice of judicial evidence. “It is a good safe rule,” says Lord Stowell, “in weighing evidence of a fact which you cannot compare with other evidence of the same fact, to compare it with the actual conduct of the persons who describe it. If their conduct is clearly such as, upon their own showing, it would not have been, taking the fact in the way in which they have represented it, it is a pretty fair inference that the fact did not so happen. If their actings, at the very time the fact happens, represent it

¹ Jardine, ii. 338, *et seq.*

in one way, and their relation of it represents it in another, why there can be no doubt which is the authentic narrative, which is the naked truth of the transaction.”¹ “It is obvious,” observes Jardine hereupon, “that this rule applies with precisely the same force to a comparison of the representations of one person with the actions of others, or with the acknowledged circumstances of a transaction to which the representations relate ; for instance, where an individual states that he did certain acts in conjunction with other persons, or gave them certain advice, if it can be shown satisfactorily that the conduct of those persons has not been such as it must necessarily have been, or that the other circumstances of the transaction have not been such as they must have been, if those acts had really been done, or that advice had in fact been given, it is a reasonable conclusion that the statements are false. And surely if this comparison of statement with conduct, is a valuable means of estimating testimony in judicial investigations at the present day, when there is usually a fair presumption that a witness is speaking the truth, it must be doubly valuable when applied to the statements of those who not only practised, but avowed and justified, as a laudable and moral principle, *equivocation, evasion, falsehood*, and even *perjury to God*, when committed by an individual in order to defeat a criminal charge made against him,” as did *Garnet* in his confession.² “Many other circumstances might be mentioned, all of which point directly to a different conclusion from that which Garnet laboured to establish on the trial, and which his apologists, with greater zeal and ingenuity than knowledge, have since urged in his

¹ See his judgment in the case of *Evans v. Evans*, Haggard's Consistory Reports, i. 41 ; Jardine, ii. 386.

² Jardine, ii. 387.

behalf. But the enumeration of all the arguments would extend these remarks to a length of dissertation altogether unjustifiable. There was great justice in what Lord Salisbury said to Garnet upon the trial, namely, that ‘all his defence was but simple negation ; whereas his privity and activity, laid together, proved him manifestly guilty.’ It is impossible to point out a single ascertained fact, either declared by him in his examinations to the commissioners, or to the jury on his trial, or revealed by him afterwards, or urged by his apologists since his death, which is inconsistent with his criminal implication in the plot. On the other hand, all the established and undisputed facts of the transaction are consistent with his being a willing, consenting, and approving confederate ; and many of them are wholly unaccounted for by any other supposition. Indeed, this conclusion appears to be so inevitable, upon a deliberate review of the details of the conspiracy and of the power and influence of the Jesuits at that period, that the doubt and discussion which have occasionally prevailed during two centuries respecting it, can only have arisen from the imperfect publication of facts, and above all, from the circumstance that the subject has always been treated in the spirit of political or religious controversy, and not as a question of mere historical criticism.”¹

At the time of Garnet’s execution the Jesuits adopted a most ingenious plan for the purpose of displaying the

¹ Jardine, ii. 402, 403. Mr. Tierney has deferred his judgment on the moral guilt of Garnet, to the occasion when he shall give the life of the Jesuit—in the concluding volumes of his excellent work ; but there can be no doubt, I think, that his judgment will coincide with that of Jardine ;—the remarks which I have quoted from him can lead to no other conclusion. There is hope that this conscientious writer may put forth from his large stores, documentary evidence to attest these necessary convictions of the acute, the candid, the unbiassed Jardine—whose “Criminal Trials” are as instructive as they are entertaining.

innocence of the guilty member : they created a miracle, not out of nothing, but out of a straw. They exhibited a straw with the face of Garnet stated to have been miraculously impressed upon it, and working wonders as usual—among the rest performing the office of a midwife ; whilst a rag stained with his blood, became a successful fever-doctor in the land of Sangrado.¹ After the execution of Oldcorne and Garnet, the most absurd tales of miracles performed, in vindication of their innocence, and in honour of their martyrdom, were industriously circulated by the Jesuits in England and in foreign countries. Thus it was said,—and the story is repeated by More, the Jesuit-historian of the English Province, by Ribadeneyra in his Catalogue of Jesuit-martyrs, by the Jesuits Bartoli and Tanner, and by other Catholic historians—that after Oldcorne had been disembowelled, according to the usual sentence in cases of treason, his entrails continued burning sixteen days, though great quantities of water were poured upon them to extinguish the flames—the sixteen days denoting the number of years that he laboured in propagating the Catholic religion in England ! The Jesuit More also relates, that from that particular spot, on the lawn at Hendlip, where Garnet and Oldcorne last set their feet before their removal, “a new and hitherto unknown species of grass grew up into the exact shape of an imperial crown, and remained for a long time without being trodden down by the feet of passengers, or eaten up by the cattle.” It was asserted too, that, immediately

¹ “Et verò cœlitus etiam prodigii opinionem spicæ illi asseri judicabant, qui miraculosè per eam se adjutos existimabant. Ex quibus matrona nobilis periculoso enixu ad vitæ desperationem adducta, reverenti ejus spicæ tactu puerum continuè incolumis enixa est. Nobilis item Hispani filiolus anno 1611, violentâ febris Gadibus de spe vitæ dejectus, applicato linteolo Garneti sanguine delibuto, illico ab æstu recreatus, postridie ex integro sanus evasit.”—*Tanner*, f. 72, et seq.

after Garnet's execution, a spring of oil suddenly burst forth at the western end of St. Paul's, on the spot where the saint was martyred.¹ But the Miraculous Straw was unquestionably the finest piece of invention exhibited by the inexhaustible Jesuits. The affair is related most diffusely by the Jesuit apologist, Eudæmon Joannes, and the other Jesuit romancers. In Spain they put forth a "Ballad of the Death of Father Garnet," with the legend and figure of the miraculous straw: it circulated throughout the provinces; and excited so much attention, that the English ambassador was actually directed by the sapient James to require its suppression by the Spanish government!²

The Jesuits made one of their English students the agent of the trick. They made him say that he felt, on the day of Garnet's execution, a most extraordinary conviction that he would see a manifest proof of the conspirator's innocence. He stood by, whilst the executioner was quartering the dead Jesuit, when a straw spotted with blood, came, he knew not how, into his hand. Subsequently, a man's face was seen peering in miniature from the precious relic—and it was pronounced the "genuine picture of Garnet most perfectly displayed in the single drop of blood."³

In those days of ignorance and superstition, when the public mind was in a state of great excitement respecting Garnet, this was a story well calculated to attract attention. Among the lower orders of the people especially, the prodigy was circulated with great diligence, and believed with implicit confidence:—whilst

¹ Bishop Hall's Sermon before the King, Sept. 19, 1624; Jardine, ii. 345.

² Winwood's Memorials, ii. 336; Jardine, ii. 345, *et seq.*

³ Tanner, 72; Jardine, ii. 347. The youth's narrative is given in full by Jardine.

the higher class of Catholics who knew better, or ought to have known better, chose to foster the delusion. The story, which was originally confined to the vulgar, gained ground by frequent repetition, until at last, and within a year of Garnet's death, by that love of the wonderful, and that tendency to exaggeration, which are the natural results of popular ignorance, it was declared, and currently believed, by Catholics both in England and abroad, that an undoubted sign from heaven had been given for the establishment of Garnet's innocence. Crowds of persons of all ranks daily flocked to see the miraculous straw. The Spanish ambassador saw and believed. The ambassador from the archduke, not only saw at the time, but long afterwards testified what he had seen by a written certificate, which is published *verbatim* by the Jesuit More.¹ In fact, the scheme was perfectly successful ; and in process of time the success of the imposture encouraged those who contrived it, or had an interest in upholding it, to add considerably to the miracle as it was at first promulgated. Wilkinson, the student, and the original observers of the prodigy, merely represented that the appearance of a face was shown on so diminutive a scale, upon the husk or sheath of a single grain, as scarcely to be visible unless specifically pointed out ; in fact, the fanciful conception, in such circumstances, is at least as reasonable as that of the everlasting "man in the moon."



¹ Morus, f. 330.

Two faces appeared upon the middle part of the straw, both surrounded by rays of glory, whilst the head of the principal figure “the likeness of a martyr’s crown



had on,”—the face of a cherub peered from the midst of his beard, “squat like a toad,”—all the curious additions being like the “bundle of sticks” on “the man in the moon :”—so blind and thoughtless are impostors, when emboldened by success.¹

¹ This is the state in which the thing appeared as the frontispiece to the

In this improved state of the miraculous straw, the story was circulated in England, excited the most profound attention, and became generally known throughout the Christian world.¹

Alluding to the "noise which Garnet's straw had made," Bishop Hall, in a contemporary letter, observes : "I had thought that our age had too many grey hairs, and with time, experience—and with experience, craft, not to have descried a juggler ; but now I see by its simplicity it declines to its second childhood. I only wonder how Fawkes and Catesby escaped the honour of saints and privilege of miracles."² Such, however, was the extent to which this ridiculous fable was believed, and so great was the scandal which it occasioned among the Protestants, that Archbishop Bancroft was commissioned by the Privy Council to call before him such persons as had been most active in propagating it, and, if possible, to detect and punish the impostors. The archbishop began the inquiry : numbers were examined : but the original agent, Wilkinson, was safe at the Jesuits' College of St. Omers, and thus the impostor escaped the punishment he most richly deserved. Nevertheless, the result of the inquiry was the complete exposure of the fraud. The "Mrs. N., the matron of singular Catholic piety," mentioned, with vast parade, in the declaration made by Wilkinson at St. Omers, was only the wife of one Hugh Griffiths, a tailor, with whom Wilkinson lodged ; and the "noble person, her intimate acquaintance," whom the impostor stated to

Apology of Eudæmon Joannes. Both are copied from Jardine's "Gunpowder Plot." The IHS and the nails below are the usual Jesuit-symbols ; and the circular inscription means "The miraculous effigy of the Reverend Father Henry Garnet, of the Company of Jesus, martyr of England, 3rd May, 1606."

¹ Jardine, ii. 347.

² Jardine, ii. 351.

have first seen the face of Garnet in the straw, turned out to be a footman named Laithwaite, in the service of a lady of quality. When separately examined, these two men contradicted each other materially ; but by their evidence it was proved that the face on the straw was a discovery made subsequently to the enclosure of the relic—the embryo Jesuit, Wilkinson, residing in the interval, for the space of seven weeks, under the same roof. “At the time of the enclosure of the straw in the bottle,” said the tailor, “and for some time afterwards, nothing was seen of the face :” it was discovered five months after the death of Garnet, by the tailor or the footman—for each claimed the honour of the first discovery. As Wilkinson was present at the time, we may form some idea of the impostor’s effrontery from the statement he put forth, declaring the discovery to have been made a few *days* after Garnet’s execution, and the enclosure of the straw. Nor is that all. The footman deposed that *he* “pointed out” the face to the tailor’s wife, and afterwards to her husband and *Wilkinson:*” whilst the young Jesuit in his declaration said : “A few days afterwards, Mrs. N. showed the straw in the bottle to a certain noble person, her intimate acquaintance, who, looking at it attentively, at length said, “I can see nothing in it but a man’s face.” Mrs. N. and myself being astonished at this unexpected exclamation, again and again examined the ear of straw, and distinctly perceived in it a human countenance, which others also, coming in as casual spectators, or expressly called by us as witnesses, also beheld at that time. This is, *as God knoweth*, the true history of Father Garnet’s Straw !”

Previously to the institution of this inquiry, the straw had been withdrawn or destroyed ; but several persons

were examined by the Archbishop of Canterbury who had repeatedly seen it, and were, therefore, fully capable of describing the curiosity. Among these a gentleman of Cambridgeshire declared "that the straw having been shown to him by Griffith's wife, he had discoursed of it to several persons when walking in St. Paul's, and told them at the time, as his real opinion was, that it seemed to him a thing of no moment ; that he saw nothing in the straw but what any painter could readily have drawn there ; that he considered it so little like a miracle, that he never asked the woman how it was done. "The face," he said, "seemed to him to be described by a hair or some very slender instrument ; and that, upon the whole, he saw nothing wonderful in the thing, except that it was possible to draw a man's face so distinctly upon so very small a space." A painter who had been shown the straw by Garnet's devoted friend Anne Vaux, was also examined by the archbishop. He made a drawing of the straw from recollection, upon the margin of the paper which contained his examination ; and expressed his opinion that "beyond all doubt, a skilful artist might depict upon a straw, a human countenance quite as artificially as that which he had seen, and more so ; and therefore that he believed it quite possible for an impostor to have fabricated this pretended miracle." With respect to the exaggeration of the miracle after this period, the testimony of Griffiths himself, given in his first examination, is sufficiently conclusive. "As far as I could discover," said he, "the face in the straw was no more like Garnet than it was like any other man with a long beard ; and truly, I think, that no one can assert that the face was like Garnet, because it was so small ; and if any man

saith the head was surrounded with a light, or rays, he saith that which is untrue."

Many other persons were examined, but no distinct evidence could be obtained as to the immediate author of the imposture. It was quite clear, however, that the face might have been described on the straw by Wilkinson, or under his direction, during the interval of many weeks which occurred between the time of Garnet's death and the discovery of the pretended miracle in the tailor's house. At all events, the inquiry had the desired effect of checking the progress of the popular delusion in England; and upon this the Privy Council took no further proceedings against any of the parties, wisely considering that the whole story was far too ridiculous to form the subject of serious prosecution and punishment.¹

"Credulity and imposture," observes Lord Bacon, "are nearly allied; and a readiness to believe and to deceive are constantly united in the same person."² As this fable of Garnet's straw illustrates in a remarkable manner the prevalence of gross superstition amongst the lower orders of Catholics in those times, so may it seem to

¹ Jardine, ii. 353, *et seq.*

² De Augment. Scient. Even in these our own times of stern realities, a partizan of the Jesuits writes as follows: "For the truth of the miraculous straw, containing Father Garnet's portrait, we have the authority of Father Gerard, in his English MS. of the Gunpowder Plot, and several other contemporaries. The reader, interested in the subject, may read the 7th book of Father More's History; pp. 95, 96, of Grene's Defence of the Jesuit's Life and Doctrine: Lord Castlemaine's *Catholique Apology*, p. 422: Challoner's *Memoirs of the Missionary Priests*, &c. Father Richard Blount [Jesuit], who was not a credulous man, in a letter dated Nov. 1606, mentions this *accurate* portrait, and affirms that 'it had been seen by Catholics and Protestants, of the best sort, and divers others. This you may boldly report, for, besides *ourselves*, a *thousand others* are witnesses of it.'"—The Rev. Dr. Oliver, of St. Nicholas' Priory, Exeter, 1838, *Collect.* p. 100, ed. 1845. It must be remembered that this *accurate* portrait was the *first*; and the presence of this Jesuit Blount, "besides *ourselves*," would seem to point at once to the guilty rogues who "had a hand in it."

show that the same superstition possessed the minds of the enlightened Jesuits, who concocted or promoted such impostures. But very strong facts militate against this excuse for the Jesuits : they themselves furnish the best proofs, perhaps, of the impious imposture. In the original trick, the face was drawn and fashioned towards the top of the ear—a portion of the husk having been removed to make the figure more conspicuous. Now, the second edition, published as a “miraculous effigy,” and elaborately engraved for the frontispiece of the Jesuit’s *Apology for Garnet*, is quite a different affair, as we have seen :—the face is placed towards the bottom of the ear, with a cherub on the beard, a cross on the forehead, and a crown on the head, whilst the whole is made radiant with light. Mere superstition is not sufficient to account for the imposture in this second state, at least. The object of the Jesuits was to remove the imputation which Garnet’s conviction had thrown upon the fame of the Company ; convinced that Garnet must be pronounced guilty by all human inference, they cunningly, unscrupulously, impiously resolved to enlist the superstition of the masses in their favour, and slandered heaven to propitiate the good-will of earth. Like the magicians of old, the Jesuits fructified their philosophical and mechanical knowledge into the invention of various tricks, which they applied, according to circumstances, as the lever of influence with the savages of their foreign missions, and their devotees in Europe. Doubtless, if a modern Jesuit, or a partisan of the “celebrated Order,” be reading this page, he will exclaim, what an unfounded assertion—false and malicious. It admits of proof, notwithstanding. We remember, in a previous page of this history, how the Jesuits, by their own description, tricked the

barbarian chieftain of Africa with a shining or reflecting and speaking picture of the Virgin Mary.¹ But let that pass, however striking ; and let us turn to their famous Father Kircher, and the curious tricks he taught, towards the middle of the century which was edified by the “miraculous picture” of Garnet on a stalk of wheat. Amongst the experiments which this Jesuit describes in his treatise on the “Magnetic Art of Light and Shade,” there is one precisely to the point in question. After illustrating by figures, how the radiating marks and concentric layers exhibited by a horizontal section of exogenous trees, may be made to represent insects and snakes, he says :—“Whoever shall penetrate more deeply into these matters, will easily invent a method by which any one will be able, by the various contortion and bending of the stalk of any plant, to sketch or draw thereon any given image.”² Assuredly Kircher could have made a variety of “miraculous effigies ;” and it appears he was ever persuaded that the secrets of art and nature might lawfully be applied to the concoction of edifying deceptions. I may as well give two examples—a fact among the savages of the foreign missions—and a suggestion for the edification of the devotees of Europe. The experiment is “to exhibit in the air a flying dragon and other portentous images of things.”

“It is related that, by this invention, some fathers of the Company of Jesus in India were delivered from the greatest dangers among the barbarians. These fathers were kept in prison, and whilst they knew of no means

¹ See vol. ii. p. 63, of the present work.

² “Qui hæc profundius penetraverit, modum faciliè inveniet, quo quisquam ex variâ contorsione, constrictioneque thyrsi alicujus plantæ datam imaginem in eâ adumbrare valeat.”—*Art. Magnet. et Magn. Lucis et Umbræ*, p. 170; *Physiologia Kircheriana*, p. 94.

to free themselves from slavery, another father, more sagacious than the rest, invented a similar contrivance—after having previously threatened the barbarians that unless they would give up his associates, they should soon see portents and experience the evident wrath of the gods—*manifestam deorum iram experturos*. The barbarians laughed at the threat. The father made the figure of a dragon out of very thin paper, which he stuffed with a mixture of brimstone and pitch, so that when ignited, the machine was lit up, and displayed, in their own language, these words: THE WRATH OF GOD. Giving the machine an immensely long tail, he flung it aloft. Wafted by the wind, it ascended—the horrifying image of a flaming dragon. Astounded by the extraordinary motion of the phantom, the barbarians, recalling to mind the angry divinity and the words of the fathers, began to fear that they were about to suffer the predicted punishment. Whereupon they instantly opened the prison and set free the fathers. In the meantime, the machine took fire and burned with a noise, as it were in approval of their deed, and remained stationary. Thus the fathers, with a natural phenomenon, obtained, by striking terror into the barbarians, what they could not purchase with a large sum of gold.”¹

After describing the method for constructing the curious “flying machine,” Kircher observes: “By this contrivance, flying angels may be easily exhibited on the day of our Lord’s ascension. The wonder of the spectacle will be increased by placing small pipes round about the machine, which, by the motion of the air, will cause a certain sweet music, together with the sound of small bells, to be placed therein.”²

And lastly, Kircher describes a curious machine

¹ *Physiol.* Kircher, p. 118.

² *Magia Catopt. Physiol.* Kircher, p. 119.

whereby “to exhibit various sights in the midst of darkness,” and concludes the description as follows: “We read in the history of the Arabians, which is entitled ‘*Dacker Ellschriphin*,’ that a certain philosophical king of Arabia performed such wonderful things by means of a similar machine, that he used to extort from his subjects whatever he wanted by these illusory portents and apparitions,—the more easily because they believed, in their simplicity, that they came from heaven.”¹

Kircher’s works are literally crammed with curious and clever applications of the various principles of physics: his “experiments,” collected and invented, must have proved wonderful means in the conversion or intimidation of the savage, and the edification of the devotees in Europe. What he had learnt from his teachers he expanded or improved; and we may, at least, ascribe to his predecessors a knowledge of the natural art magic sufficient to effectuate all their influence in the East and in the West, among barbarians, and in Europe among the devotees of the Catholic Church—always ready to be imposed upon by “the good fathers” of every Order, monastical or sacerdotal. “The master of superstition is the people,” says Bacon, “and in all superstition wise men follow fools; and arguments are fitted to practice—in a reversed order. It was gravely said, by some of the prelates in the Council of Trent, where the doctrines of the schoolmen bear great sway, that the schoolmen were like astronomers, which did feign eccentrics and epicycles, and such engines of orbs, to save the phenomena, though they knew there were

¹ Ibid. p. 128. Kircher was the inventor of the magic lantern, or rather, he perfected the contrivance, which was in use long before his time, as shown by the anecdote above.

no such things ; and, in like manner, that the schoolmen had framed a number of subtile and intricate axioms and theorems, to save the practice of the Church. The causes of superstition are, pleasing and sensual rites and ceremonies,—excess of outward and pharisaical holiness,—over-great reverence of traditions, which cannot but load the Church,—the stratagems of prelates for their own ambition and lucre,—the favouring too much of *good intentions*, which openeth the gate to conceits and novelties,—the taking an aim at divine matters by human, which cannot but breed mixture of imaginations,—and, lastly, barbarous times, especially when joined with calamities and disasters.”¹ This last named cause of superstition is sufficient of itself to account for the pitiful benightment of the Catholics of England, in the bitter times when Garnet’s straw could make a sainted martyr out of a willing regicide and ruthless incendiary.² But when we know that in the midst of the miseries which their missionaries brought upon them, they

¹ Essays, Of Superstition.

² Rant, the agent of the Catholic Bishop of England, says : “The summer, 1624, Mr. Read, the Scottishman, Peter Fitton, and I, saw Garnet’s picture in the grand Gesù gallery, with this subscription,—‘*Propter fidem Catholicam—For the Catholic faith.*’ I spake of it to Mr. Peter, in my lodging (he coming in company with my Lord Windsor, in February, 1625) against this inscription, saying he died *for treason*, and how I would complain of it. Mr. Clayton and I went thither in April, 1625. It was changed, and only,—‘*Ab Hæreticis occisus*, 1606.’ Yet the straw is there, and transposed to the right hand, which is the less perspicuous part of the alley.”—*MS. apud Tierney*, v. 107, note. Hence it is evident that the belief in Garnet’s innocence and sanctity was not universal amongst the Catholics. The dupes of the Jesuits were, for the most part, their own devotees. The Catholic church-historian, Dodd, thus concludes his remarks on the Plot : “To conclude with what relates to Garnet’s being a martyr and worker of miracles, I leave the reader to form a judgment of those matters from the circumstances of his life and behaviour ; to which it will conduce very much, if we consider how far he could preserve a good conscience, in the commerce he had with the conspirators. The same, I say, as to his miracles, which are to be credited or disregarded with respect to proofs. Neither the Church of Rome, nor the body of English Catholics, are under any obligation to become a party in such kind of controversies.”

experienced some comfort from their grovelling superstitions, however much we would denounce these in other circumstances—in the present day—we may be permitted to commiserate rather than stigmatise that wretched refuge for those who were in bitterness of heart—proscribed—hunted down and torn by their rulers, who were compelled to suspect them of treason to their sovereign and country, whilst their religious teachers aggravated the poignancy of their sorrows, by exhibiting against each other a degree of rancour and hostility so fierce and determined, that it may be doubted whether the Catholic cause in England was more thwarted by the government which connected it with treason, than by that intestine warfare which called forth the worst of human passions from the hearts of its leaders—the secular priests, the monks, and the Jesuits. This important page of Jesuit-history now demands attention.

“All the animosity ’twixt Jesuits and priests, and priests and others, rises from *meum* and *tuum*,” said Signor La Scala to Rant ; “a Jesuit will not let a priest come where he has to do, nor a priest let a Jesuit where he has power.”¹

The contention began with the reign of Elizabeth—and the “occasional conformity” of the Catholics was the motive. Tracts teemed from both sides—conferences were held—the fathers of the Council of Trent were appealed to—and the non-conformists gained the day. Allen’s missionary priests soon came over to confirm the decision, and promote its consequences. But in 1579 the English College at Rome was taken from the secular priests and handed over to the Jesuits. This transfer was connected with the political partyism

¹ Tierney, v. 105, note.

running high amongst the leaders of the Catholics, and the students who were preparing for the same position. Some ranged with many of the secular clergy, on the side of the Scottish succession,—others, under the wing of Parsons, and the other Jesuits, contended for the Spanish chimæra. This question was the source of general excitement among the evangelists of the mission. The college at Rome was not a Goshen in the benighted Egypt of politico-religious contention. For some time, and from various causes, a spirit of discontent had existed in the establishment. Under the superintendence of an inefficient rector, the discipline of the house had been relaxed; impunity on the one hand, and remissness and incapacity on the other, were producing their natural results—when Parsons published his *Conference on the Succession*. The book was introduced into the college: political excitement was now added to private animosity. In an instant, the flame was enkindled: the discontented openly ranged themselves under the banners of the Scottish party: the grievances, real and imaginary, which had formed the subject of complaint, were exaggerated to the utmost: particular wrongs were aggravated by the recital of public injuries. The opposition of the other party was denounced as tyranny—its actions as the offspring of ambition; and a demand was made for the recall of the fathers from the English mission—for their removal from the government of the college—and for an alteration in many of the principal rules of the establishment.¹ Thus did the famous or infamous book of the Jesuit, react, indirectly, against his own Company: whilst to others at Rome that book was a joke, it thus became a serious infliction on the

¹ Tierney, iii. 38, note.

Company itself: for this disorganised, disorderly college was managed by the Jesuits.¹

The first impulse of Aquaviva, the general of the Jesuits, was to yield the point, and to abandon the superintendence of the college: but the advocates of the Spanish interest, alarmed by that rumour, resolved to oppose the prudent impulse of the general. Dr. Barret, the President of Douay College, who was in Rome at the time, hastened to the pope, and “in the name of every missionary—and every Catholic in England—in the name of the colleges and the martyrs—and the English Church,”—implored the pontiff—as he valued the cause in which they were engaged, to prevent the resignation contemplated by the general of the Jesuits. Petitions swarmed from various quarters: the leaders abroad—of all ranks and conditions—were stirred to avert the threatened calamity. Still the matter remained in suspense, when Parsons arrived at Rome. His influence and address revived the hopes and won the confidence of all parties. He listened to the complaints of the scholars—discussed with them the subject of

¹ A striking illustration, connected with the subject, is given by Mr. Tierney. On the occasion of the disturbance in the English seminary, in 1596, the office of protector of the English mission was conferred on Cardinal Tolet, who, from a Jesuit, was made a cardinal by Clement VIII., as the reader remembers. From the man's benevolence, equity, and moderation, as venerated on all sides, it was hoped that better days would dawn for the wretched corporation; but, unfortunately, the protector lived only a few months: a short illness ended his life, in the course of the year after his appointment. Tolet discountenanced the machinations of the Spanish faction; and Parsons, in revenge for his having discouraged it in the seminary, recorded the cardinal's name and his death, in a paper which still bears the following title,—“An Observation of certain apparent Judgments of Almighty God against such as have been seditious in the English Catholic cause, for these nine or ten years past.” The paper is in the Stonyhurst MSS. (Ang. A. ii. 44); for an account, however, of the learning, the virtue, and the ardent piety of this distinguished and amiable prelate, see Ciacconius, ii. 1872; Southwell, Bibl. 258, and the numerous authorities cited by them. Tierney, v. Append. cxlix. note.

their grievances ; and, having promised them redress where it was practicable, engaged them ultimately to acquiesce in cheerful submission to his judgment. Thereupon three of them were, by his advice, dispatched to the English mission—ten were removed to Douay—and then the congratulations of his friends, the thanks of the students, acknowledged the important service which he had rendered to the cause. To the pope Father Parsons presented a memorial in vindication of the Jesuit-rector and of the Company, and in opposition to the demands of the scholars. And yet, Dr. Barret himself, the prime mover of the opposition, had written to Parsons the following strong avowal. “ This rector will never be able to rule in this place. Many things I can tell you of that must be amended in the manner of government.”¹

At the very moment when these English students were calling for the removal of the Jesuits, the English exiles in Flanders were besieging the pontiff with their complaints against the Company. The Jesuit Holt was the cause of the strife. He was a zealous advocate of the Spanish succession, was employed in Brussels, as the agent of the king, and the administrator of the funds devoted by that monarch to the support of the exiles. Holt was a man of character and talent : but the austerity of his manners was embittered by the violence of his politics ; and the “ tyranny ” of Father Holt soon became a topic of loud and incessant animadversion

¹ Letter of Dr. Barret to Parsons, apud Tierney, iii. Append. xv. “ Parsons, in his *Briefe Apologie* (54 b.) professes to print this letter ; but his object, both there and in other places, is, to free the government of the Society from all imputation ; and, accordingly, he suppresses the whole of the passage which I have printed in italics.”—*Tierney*, *ibid.* The portion suppressed (including the above declaration) forms about a fourth of a very long letter. The passage, as Mr. Tierney insinuates, was certainly calculated to do more harm than good to the faction, since it admits the justice of the demonstration.

among the members of the opposite party. Charges and recriminations followed each other rapidly: political animosity lost nothing of its intensity by being united to religious rancour. To counteract this demonstration the Jesuits had recourse to the usual expedient. They got up petitions among their friends: papers declaratory of the zeal and prudence, both of the fathers in general, and of Holt in particular, were prepared, and circulated for subscription. Seven superiors of Douay, eighteen clergymen, and ninety-nine laymen, including soldiers and women, "gave a character" to the Jesuits. "With the means by which some of these signatures were obtained," says Mr. Tierney, "there is every reason to be dissatisfied: that of Guy Fawkes was amongst them." Holt gained the day:—the charges against him were pronounced "unfounded, trivial, or doubtful," in order to prevent an inquiry which might prove injurious to the Company. It was evident to the Jesuit-provincial that no permanent tranquillity could be established until Holt was removed from Brussels: but Aquaviva resolved that the obnoxious Jesuit should remain; and to varnish the affair, he ordered that letters should be obtained from the cardinal of the country, stating that the Jesuit was found innocent after all parties had been heard,"—although there was no investigation at all. A copy was to be sent to Rome, and a copy was to be given to Holt, so as to be ready "if anything were cast in their faces—*si quid contrà jactaretur*." Such was Aquaviva's prescription for this intestine disorder, whilst the real motive for Holt's retention, as assigned by Parsons himself, was, that his services were deemed necessary to the promotion of *Ferdinand's designs against England*!¹

But the consequence of the Jesuit-management of the

¹ Tierney, iii. 39, Append. xvii.

English College at Rome had been disastrous to the mission, to the secular interest. The transfer had been brought about by intrigue : the seculars who lent themselves to the Jesuits bequeathed its penalty to their cause ; and the penalty was soon forthcoming. The college was still to serve as a nursery for the clergy ; but the Jesuits reaped a double advantage by the change of management. The juniors of their Company had a maintenance, and enjoyed an opportunity for improving themselves, by being made tutors to the clergy, and subsidiary professors. Moreover, the college became a kind of nursery for their order ; for very often those students who were designed for the clergy, before they had completed their studies, were enrolled among the Jesuits. But the greatest advantage to their Company was, their control and management of the revenues belonging to the college—1500*l. per annum*.¹

“It is no small advantage to the Jesuits,” says the Catholic historian, “to have the management of the temporals belonging to the clergy ; and, on the contrary, no less a disadvantage to the clergy, to be documented by persons of a different interest in the controversies of life. The effects of this kind of education appeared very visibly among the missionaries in England, about the year 1595 ; especially in the castle of Wisbeach, where a great many of them being kept prisoners, a scandalous rupture happened amongst them.”²—“Originally introduced as assistants,” says another Catholic historian, “the Jesuits, with the advantage of a resident superior, had gradually become the most influential members of the English mission. They possessed more extensive faculties [or “privileges,”] than the clergy. They were attached to the principal families, and were the channel

¹ Dodd, ii. 168, *et seq.*

² Id. iii. 38, *et seq.*

through which the funds, for the maintenance both of the clergy and the poor, were chiefly administered. The younger missionaries, educated in the colleges of the fathers, and still looking to them for support, naturally placed themselves under their guidance: the elder clergy, on the other hand, superseded in their authority, and deprived, in a great measure, of their influence, regarded the members of the Society in the light of rivals. In addition to this, the political feelings before-mentioned were at work. Human nature, on both sides, yielded to the impulse. What one sought to recover, the other sought to retain and enlarge: the jealousies of the college were extended to the mission; and each believed, or sought to make others believe, that his opponents were the destroyers of religion.”¹

Whilst persecution raged without, these confessors of the faith within the walls of a prison could find no peace amongst themselves: persecuted by the heretics, these men of orthodoxy persecuted each other, even on the brink of the grave—in sight of the scaffold, whereon, at a moment’s notice, they might be summoned to become “martyrs” for the veneration of posterity! I suppress the multitudinous reflections which rush to the mind to explain, to illustrate this striking phenomenon of the human mind, in connection with man, the persecuting animal.

There were three-and-thirty prisoners for “the faith” in Wisbeach castle. Only two were Jesuits—one Father Weston and Thomas Pound, or Pond, the quondam cavalier, but now a Jesuit layman. The Jesuit conceived the very laudable project, as it would appear, of regulating the company of confessors by means of certain rules, as to the hours of rising, eating, studies, prayer, and recrea-

¹ Tierney, *ubi suprà*.

tion, whereby, as far as circumstances would permit, they might appear like a college, or regular community. When such a comfortable plan was thought capable of execution, it must be inferred that imprisonment for "the faith," in the days of Elizabeth, was not, after all, the frightful thing of the martyr-mongers. Garnet, then residing in London, drew up the plan of prison-discipline ; and Weston proposed its execution. The seculars opposed it ; but the Jesuit had meditated the scheme of government, and had made up a party, nineteen out of the thirty-three confessors. He arranged all his measures for a demonstration ; and, by way of preliminary, he absented himself from the table in the common hall of the otherwise comfortable prisoners. His absence for several days elicited various remarks from the brethren : these remarks were mentioned to the Jesuit, and he at once declared that, unless his companions would submit to some regular mode of life, his conscience would not permit him again to join their society.¹ Decidedly this was a severe reproach to the community. It implied the bitter disgrace of unrepentant guilt—the inveterate habit of sin. Accordingly, about the same time, a letter, subscribed by eighteen of the captive clergymen, the friends of Weston, was addressed to Garnet. This letter denounced the conduct of the other prisoners, charged them with the grossest violations of morality, and requested such counsel and assistance from the chosen adviser, as would best enable them to avoid the scandal that must attach to the disorders of their companions.²

A few days later the same parties subscribed the

¹ Dodd, iii. 40 ; Tierney's note, *ibid.* 42, *et seq.*

² Parsons, Brief Apol. 71 ; Tierney, *ubi suprà*, 43.

rules for their future government, and elected Weston for their superior. The Jesuit accepted the appointment provided the consent of his superior, Garnet, should be obtained. The whole machination was, of course, well known to Garnet, and his consent, with certain politic restrictions as to Weston's authority, soon gave completeness to the scheme. All had been done in secret : and as soon as the affair was discovered, Bagshawe, the leader of the dissidents, wrote to Garnet, complaining that Weston and his friends, by withdrawing from their society, were reflecting on the character of the other prisoners. He called upon Garnet, as the author of the separation, to exert his influence in re-establishing the harmony of the place. Garnet's reply is still preserved, and is published by Mr. Tierney. In this paper, he assured his correspondent that no censure was intended to be cast on the conduct or reputation of the other party ! Weston and his friends had mistrusted their *own* virtue : they had associated for their own improvement ; and had confined their accusations to their own frailties ! As for himself, he was neither the author, nor the approver of the separation. He had merely yielded to the entreaties of those who must have understood their own necessities ; and he could not now venture, without further information, to disturb the arrangement which had been already made. "Let me exhort you, then," he continued, "by the charity of your Redeemer, though separated in body, to be united in affection. Suffer your brethren to adopt a rule which no law forbids, no vow has rendered criminal ; and in the meantime, continue to pursue your own course, regulate your actions according to your own views, and live *as you hitherto have lived*, in a manner worthy

of the learning and piety of the priesthood : *Vos interim vivite ut vultis ; id est, ut presbyteros doctos ac pios decet, quod hactenus fecistis.*" "Garnet forgot, when he wrote this," observes Mr. Tierney, "that in the preceding July, he had not only declared the opponents of Weston to have been habitually guilty of almost every species of immorality, but had concluded his report significantly, reminding the general of his order, that the very man whom, he was now addressing as his 'dearest and most loving' friend, had, in earlier life, been '*deservedly* expelled from the Roman college !'" Nay, this most desperate prevaricator actually told Bagshawe that Weston's party "had not written a word to him, whereby the reputation of any one might be injured"! Here-upon Mr. Tierney very properly says :—"If this was true, upon what authority did Garnet advance the serious charges contained in his letter to the general ? The fact, however, is, as the reader already knows, that Weston's friends *had* written the most serious accusations against their opponents : but, because these accusations were general against the whole body, and not directed against any individual *by name*, Garnet seems to have considered himself justified in asserting that "no *one's* character" had been impeached."¹ This early specimen of the Jesuit's equivocation is somewhat interesting. Nor is his duplicity of heart less striking, for he tells this Bagshawe, whom he scoffingly represented to the general, as a man deservedly expelled from the Roman College, that he "embraces him in particular with due charity and affection, and that he has ever desired, to the utmost of his heart, to be dear to him !"²

¹ Tierney, iii. Append. cxiii. note ; Parsons, Briefe Apol. 71 b.

² The two sentiments, with the interval of only three months between them,

Disputes and contradictions, charges and recriminations, disorder and violence, for more than nine months continued to distract the unhappy community. The scandal produced by the affair, filled the country, when two of the clergy, hastening from the north, undertook the office of mediators. They failed in their attempt to reconcile the parties ; and then they sought and obtained an interview with Garnet. The Jesuit had refused to interfere in the strife ; if we may believe his opponents he now repeated his refusal, “and was pleased to observe, that it would conduce very much to the good of the Catholic cause, if the clergy were to be under the direction of their society, not only in the colleges, but also when they returned into England upon the mission.” In the course of the conversation, however, he gradually relaxed, came into the views of the pacificators, and finally, he undertook to write to Weston, and prepare the way for an amicable adjustment of all the differences.¹ Every serious obstacle was now

contrast most curiously side by side. *July 12th* (to Aquaviva), “*Quamvis qui inter tredecim illos caput esse vult, olim ab Urbano collegio jure expulsus fuerit.*” *Oct. 8th* (to Bagshawe himself), “*Equidem omnes vos eâ charitate atque amore complector quâ par est—te imprimis, cui me semper charum esse summis votis expetivi.*” See both the documents in *Tierney*, iii. *Append.* xix.

¹ *Tierney*, iii. 44. Respecting the declaration attributed to Garnet, touching the necessity of subjecting the clergy to the Jesuits, Mr. Tierney says : “I am not disposed entirely to reject it. When the students at Rome petitioned for the removal of the fathers from the English mission, Parsons undertook to oppose the prayer, and to assign the reasons for its rejection. The Society, he assured the pontiff, was essential to the existence of religion in this country. To the laity its members were necessary, to counsel, to strengthen, and to protect them ;—to the clergy, to support, to correct, and to restrain them. Already the latter [the clergy], by their *vices and their apostacy*, had become objects of aversion or of distrust to the Catholics. Were the fathers to be removed, the people would be left without advisers, the clergy without guides ; the salt would be taken from the earth, and the sun would be blotted from the heavens of the English Church ! ‘*Certè, quisquis infelicissimo illi regno Societatis operam aufert, ille plane totius illius terræ salem, imò et afflictissimæ illius ecclesiæ*

removed : a new code of rules was drawn up and signed : the prisoners again assembled at the common table ; and Garnet received the thanks and congratulations of all parties. 'Tis the old song of the Jesuits : they strove and resisted as long as they could ; and when they found the thing impracticable, they "split the difference," and beautifully made "a virtue of necessity"—one of the best virtues made by man.¹

Three years after occurred the contention for the establishment of an episcopal superior to the English mission. The last Catholic bishop, Dr. Watson, of Lincoln, died in 1584 :—during the interval Allen was the general inspector over the missionaries, though materially "unserviceable as to the immediate parts of the episcopal character," being a simple priest : he died in 1594, and the English Catholics became a flock without a pastor. The clergy applied to the pope for one or more bishops ; and Parsons, then "the chief person in credit at Rome," seemed at first to enter into the project : but he soon altered his conduct. Reflection

solem tollere videtur' (*Domest. Diff.* 166—169). When Parsons could deliberately express or quote such an opinion of the relative merits of the two parties, the sentiment attributed to Garnet, and, perhaps, uttered under the excitement produced by opposition, ceases to be improbable."—*Ibid.* and *Append.* clxii. note.

¹ Animadverting on the conduct of Garnet in this affair, and remarking the peculiar expressions which the Jesuit has used in endorsing the different letters he received from the priests, Mr. Tierney observes : "How strangely do these few simple words contradict the whole of the studied assurances in the letter to Bagshawe, and how painfully do they reveal the fact, that, whilst those who were supposed to have been his enemies, had thrown aside every embittering recollection, and were pouring out their hearts in thankfulness to him, Garnet himself was, in private, recurring to the memory of the past, for the very purpose of pronouncing an implied censure upon their conduct ! Yet, addressing Bagshawe in another letter, only nine days later, he says : 'When the blessed souls in heaven did sing, with one consent, 'Glory be to God on high,' you at Wisbeach preached and restored comfort, 'and in earth peace to men of goodwill.'"—*True Relation*, 43 ; *Tierney*, iii. *Append.* xx. note.

persuaded him that the paramount object of his party—the choice of a successor to the English throne—might be more surely promoted by a different arrangement. If the secular clergy could be subjected to the control of a single superior, and if that superior could be made entirely dependent on the Company, it was clear that, when the proper moment should arrive, the influence of the whole body might be exerted in support of his favourite design—the Spanish succession. The Jesuit's scheme, accordingly, was that the clergy should be under the government of a simple priest, bearing the title of archpriest, and enjoying episcopal jurisdiction—an institution especially directed to the promotion of the designs of the King of Spain against James of Scotland.¹ It was necessary, however, that the Jesuit's scheme should be clothed with a specious pretext, in order to get it accepted; and this pretext was that the appointment of Catholic bishops would offend Queen Elizabeth—who, with her ministers, positively *favoured* the design, because she was perfectly aware of the political object which Parsons concealed under the holy institution of an archpriest. And then, the “comprehensive mind” of the crafty Jesuit turned the political approbation of Elizabeth to his purpose; and “the known wishes of Elizabeth and her ministers, *in favour* of the episcopal appointment, was the reason assigned to the pope for the establishment of a different form of government.”² By such methods of low cunning how could any

¹ “La stessa institutione [del arciprete] fu drizzata specialmente alla promotione delli disegni del re di Spagna contra quel che allora era il vero pretensore, ed adesso è il possessore, di nostra corona.”—*Stonyhurst MSS. Ang. A. iii. 38*; *apud Tierney*, iii. 47.

² Tierney, iii. 47. Plowden, Remarks on Berington, 123; and the Memorial of Parsons against the appointment of more than one archpriest.—*Apud Tierney*, iii. *Append.* xxxiv.

project be carried out with permanent success and edification ?

Cardinal Cajetan was the appointed protector of the English mission : he gave into the scheme of Father Parsons ; and in 1598 he named Blackwell, a clergyman, to take the title of archpriest, who, with a certain number of assistants, was to manage the concerns of the clergy. The whole transaction was carried on privately, and without the knowledge or advice of the chief persons of the clergy. They were, consequently, hugely provoked at the concoction, “and took the liberty to stand off, till they had been heard at Rome.” Nor is this result to be wondered at, since even according to Parsons himself, out of four hundred clergymen then in England, the whole number, exclusive of Blackwell and the assistants, who subscribed in favour of the appointment, was only *fifty-seven*.¹

Loud were the just complaints of the seculars against the scheme, whose practical deficiencies were certainly not supplied by its political and selfish object. Every possible objection might be made to it in the episcopal point of view, whilst the method and source of its concoction immensely aggravated the indignation of the seculars. “It was a contrivance of Father Robert Parsons and the Jesuits, who had the liberty to nominate both the archpriest and his assistants.”²

The result may be expected. The seculars resolved to contest the appointment, and sent two agents to Rome

¹ Briefe Apol. 106 ; Tierney, iii. 49. Yet Garnet, with his usual falsehood, in a letter enclosing the names of seventeen priests in Wisbeach, who approved of the new institution, gravely affirms that the opposition to it was nothing more than the schismatical hostility “of a few turbulent youths—*juvenum quorundam inquietorum*.”—Tierney, *ubi supra*, referring to the modern Jesuit Plowden, 336.

² Dodd, iii. 49.

to lay their case before the pontiff. But the Jesuit-party bestirred themselves in the usual way. Before the two agents arrived at Rome, care was taken to send injurious characters before them, which, in short, were that they were the heads and ringleaders of a number of factious priests, who arrogated to themselves the name of the English clergy. Barret again interfered, and dispatched to Cajetan a paper which he signed as president of Douay College, together with three doctors, "foreign" Englishmen abroad, who took an interest in the triumph of the Jesuit-vultures, or rather catered for their meal on the carrion of the English mission and clergy. This paper was written in the most offensive style of the time, and expressed a hope "that some example of severe coercion would be used upon the deputies, to the end that others of the same faction and boldness should be held in their duty." Of the effect produced by these defamatory reports on the mind of the pope, we may judge from the fact, that Bellarmine, in a letter to Parsons, informed him that the pope had already determined, if the agents came to Ferrara, where he then was, to commit them to prison.¹ Their departure excited the anger of Blackwell. He denounced their conduct as rebellious, their party as abettors of schism, and the leading men among the "appellants," as they were called, he constantly branded with the most opprobrious epithets. In vain was the promise to acquiesce in his authority; in vain was the complaint against his injurious language; in vain was their request to be informed of the precise nature of his accusations. They were answered only by suspension from the arch-priest, and by angry invectives from the press. The

¹ Tierney, iii. 50; Parsons, Briefe Apol. 125.

Jesuit Lister, in his "Treatise of Schism," boldly proclaimed them to have "fallen from the church and spouse of Christ," to have become "irregular and excommunicate—a scandal to the good—infamous to all." Subsequently Parsons published his elaborate Apology in defence of the archpriest's pretensions, and to give it authority, and, of course, to injure the cause of the appellants, he pretended, in the title-page, that it was written "*by priests united in due subordination to the archpriest!*"¹ It is as sport to a fool to do mischief: but these mighty men of old were men of "understanding," men of "wisdom," the so-called holy fathers of "the Church," venerable by age, learning, and prerogative! If the heretics had acted thus by them, what a pitiable case it would have been! But here we have a set of religionists, proscribed by the state, ever in danger of "martyrdom," and yet brimful of rancour, unquenchable hatred against their brethren, and not hesitating to resort to the guiltiest means of "putting down" their opponents—by calumnious imputations. Nor did they stop there.

Whilst the excitement produced by these proceedings was at its height, the agents arrived in Rome. They were at first received by Parsons in the college, but afterwards expelled, to seek a lodging in the town. About three weeks after, and in the middle of the night, they were suddenly arrested by a company of the pope's guards, conveyed under escort to the English college, and committed to the custody of Parsons, who placed them in separate apartments. For nearly four months, they were thus confined: their papers were seized: they were debarred from all communication

¹ Dodd, iii. 51; Tierney, ib. 52, with authorities.

with each other, secluded from the counsel and intelligence of their friends, and subjected to a series of insulting and harassing examinations—conducted by Parsons, and registered by Tichbourne, another member of the Company. Two cardinals then arrived at the college, and the agents, instead of being allowed to discharge their commission as such, were in reality placed on their defence as prisoners—as criminals ; and a process, bearing all the characteristics of a trial, immediately commenced. The previous depositions were read : new charges of ambition, and of a design to procure mitres for themselves, were urged against the deputies : the procurators of the archpriest were heard in aggravation : and the accused, having been permitted to reply, were remanded to their confinement, there to await the decision of the court. This decision was pronounced about two months after : the deputies were released,—but they were ordered to leave Rome within ten days : they were forbidden to return either to England, Scotland, or Ireland, without the express permission of the pope, or the cardinal protector of the English mission—they would incur the penalty of suspension if they presumed to disregard this prohibition.¹ Now, all this statement, all this injustice and oppression are *Catholic* facts ; and we may fairly ask how the Jesuits could complain subsequently of the proceedings against Garnet by the Protestants, whose king their faction intended to blow to atoms, with the utter destruction of their opponents ? Indeed, the principle on which Mr. Tierney's elucidation of the affair is based, may serve, in the eyes of the politician, to excuse King James and his party, as

¹ Tierney, quoting the account drawn up under the eye of Dr. Bishop, one of the deputies, iii. 52.

well as the pope and his Jesuits. "It is evident," says he, "that these proceedings were adopted, principally, if not entirely, as a matter of precaution. A great political object was in view. Had Bishop and his companion, (the deputies) been permitted to approach the pontiff, or to converse freely with his officers, a new impression might have been created as to the wants and wishes of the English Catholics ; and, in that case, the institution of the archpriest, which, in the minds of its projectors, was to determine the future destinies of the throne, might have been overturned. By first sequestering, and afterwards dismissing, the deputies, this danger was avoided. The pontiff heard nothing but what might be prudent to lay before him : his impressions were left undisturbed, and he willingly subscribed the breve, by which Blackwell's authority was confirmed."¹ This attempted and, perhaps, excusable defence of the pope might be permitted to pass, if we did not know that the pope in question is no other than *Clement VIII.*, so completely compromised in the scheme against the British succession—the same pope, precisely, who lent himself to all the mean tricks of Aquaviva's rebellious subjects—not even hesitating to countenance the last disgraceful betrayal concocted by a Jesuit against his general, and promoted by the Spaniards—as I have related at large. On the other hand, what are we to think of this Parsons and his faction, who scrupled not to commit the most flagrant injustice, in order to advance the scheme which they had vowed to execute ? And thus it was ; and thus it ever will be, when the leaders of men conceive and concoct some promising scheme : a specious name will not be wanting to christen

¹ *Ubi suprâ*, p. 53.

the bantling—and under that name will it go, though it will never be anything but the child of its parent—exhibiting its family-vices at every stage of its development.

The appellants at first submitted to this papal decree against them : but once more exasperated by the conduct of the archpriest, who persisted in denouncing them as schismatics, they appealed to the Sorbonne of Paris. This faculty, so famous or infamous for their decision in favour of rebellion against their king, kept up the disgraceful agitation in England by an unbecoming, though invited, interference in the strife of the factions ; and declared that the appellants were “ free from the sin of disobedience or schism, till the pope had confirmed the archpriest’s power in a more canonical way” than was vouchsafed by the breve in question. In a violent paper, the archpriest condemned the Sorbonne’s decision, and followed up his desperate indignation with measures of severity against the leaders of his opponents. Thereupon, thirty-three clergymen, in a regular instrument, solemnly appealed to the judgment of the Apostolic See, which had sacrificed them, on the former occasion, to Parsons and his faction.¹

“ It was not to be expected,” says Mr. Tierney, “ that this contest would escape the notice of the government. Elizabeth had watched its progress. She was aware of its political origin ; and while, on the one hand, perhaps she sought to weaken the body by division, on the other she not unnaturally inclined towards that party, whose loyalty was less open to suspicion. By degrees, the appellants were relieved from many restraints, imposed by the law upon the Catholic clergy. In some

¹ Dodd, *ubi supra* ; Tierney, *ubi supra*.

instances, they were removed from the confinement of a jail, to become prisoners at large. They were permitted to correspond with each other ; and were provided with facilities for the publication of tracts, intended to vindicate their proceedings against the attacks of their adversaries. * * * * About the end of June, 1601, Bluet [one of the appellants] was secretly introduced to some of the members of the privy council, and by their means, was admitted to the presence of the queen. Of the conference which ensued we are acquainted only with the result. It was determined that Bagshawe, Champney, Barnaby, and Bluet himself, who were all under restraint, should be forthwith discharged, that they should be permitted to visit their friends, for the purpose of collecting money, and that, as soon as their preparations were complete, they should receive passports, which, *under the pretence of banishing them*, would enable them to leave the country, and proceed to prosecute their appeal in Rome.”¹

It is absolutely necessary to correct the impression, conveyed by the wording of this statement, that this scheme originated with the queen and council. Such was not the fact, however. The desperate Parsons, who “trimmed,” and “swindged” all the world in his glorious fury—as though the memory of his early misfortune at Oxford was ever his incubus—subsequently took Bluet in hand, and gave his precious secret to the winds—having secured an important paper for the construction of *his* Flaming Dragon, with no lack of pitch and brimstone within, and God’s wrath for a superscription. Here is Bluet’s letter to a brother appellant, as published by Parsons, in his *Briefe Apologie*.

¹ Tierney, iii. 53.

“What you do abroad, or what you think, I do not know ; for I know not how to write unto you. I spare not my body, nor my purse, in following this matter, &c. These fourteen weeks, I have spent £12 ; and in dividends I have not received seven shillings. *Sed non in hoc justificatus sum.* The case standeth thus :—I have by opening the cause unto their honours and to Cæsar (*the queen*), obtained that four principal men shall be banished, after a sort, to follow the appeal,—Doctors Bagshawe, Bluet, Champney, and Barnaby, all prisoners. They shall be here with me on Wednesday next. A month they shall have, within the realm, of liberty, to ride abroad for money amongst their friends, and then choose their port [of embarkation], to be gone with some countenance.

“I hope no man will be offended with *this plot of mine*, but with their purses assist us. It hath cost me many a sweat, and many bitter tears ere I could effect it.

“I have, in some sort, pacified the wrath of our prince conceived against us, and of her council, and *have laid the fault where it ought to be, and proved that the secular priests are innocent for the most part*, &c. Be cheerful and hope well—in *spe contra spem* ; and keep this secret to yourself.

“I have made Mr. Watson’s peace, if he will himself. When I come down, I will tell you more. You are well thought of, &c.

“Yours,

“THOMAS BLUET.”

“*Pridie visitationis B. V. Mariæ, 1601.*”¹

What a strange, humiliating conviction must be forced by these facts, upon the mind of those who even at the

¹ Briefe Apol. 210 ; Tierney, Append. xxxi. It is only fair to give Mr. Tierney’s very interesting note on this letter. “I print this letter as it is given by Parsons in his Briefe Apologie ; and, as far as it concerns the particular point for which I have cited it, it is sufficient. It is right, however, to remark, that it is confessedly only an extract ; that there is an omission at each of the places marked by an ‘&c.’ ; and that, as Parsons has inserted it for the express purpose of attacking Bluet, it is not improbable that only so much is given as seemed best qualified to answer this purpose. Parsons, in fact, was never scrupulous in his mode of dealing with these papers. Three instances of his infidelity the reader has already seen ; a fourth, not less remarkable than the others, at this moment occurs to me. With a view to set forth the importance of his own services in the pacification of the Roman College, he prints, among other documents, a portion of a letter, addressed to him by the general

present day, would fain persuade the world that the leaders of that "religious" movement of Rome and Jesuitism, were different to the other Pharisees and Scribes whom Christ denounced so bitterly ! Still worse convictions will follow.

All was ready for this extraordinary expedition of the liberated confessors ; but, almost at the moment of their departure, a papal breve came upon them, confirming the archpriest's appointment, but still condemning his irritating conduct. It suppressed the Jesuit Lister's Treatise, and all other publications connected with the controversy—for pamphlets had, as usual, swarmed like *wasps* at midsummer. But the appeal of the appellants was rejected, though the breve seriously admonished the archpriest on the intemperance of his

of the Society, only a few days before matters were arranged with the students. In it Aquaviva looks forward to a speedy termination of all differences ; tells Parsons that, in appeasing the tumults, and reforming the disorders of the college, he will have all the merit of a second founder ; and then concludes—so Parsons at least assures us, with the following invitation to Naples. 'This lord viceroy desireth much to see you here shortly ; and I have committed the matter to your own consideration for the time, what will be most convenient.'—(*Briefe Apol.* 58). To avoid the possibility of doubt or mistake, a marginal note is affixed to this passage ; and we are there distinctly informed that the viceroy alluded to is 'the Counte Olyvares.' Now, the original of the letter here cited, which is in Spanish, is at this moment before me ; and will the reader believe that it not only does not contain the passage in question, but that it makes not the most distant allusion to anything of the kind : that neither the viceroy, nor any other person whatsoever, is mentioned ; and that what is here represented as the anxiety of a great man to see him, is, in reality, nothing more than the expression of a hope on the part of the writer, that he (Parsons) will continue to employ his piety and prudence in the affair with which he is intrusted, that he will see every necessity as it arises, and will apply such remedies, at such time, and in such manner, as shall be most conducive to the great object in view ? I subjoin the words of the original. 'No tengo que decir en este particular, sino esperar que vuestra reverenciã, con su religion y prudencia yra viendo todos los particulares, y applicando los remedios quales, quando, y como conberna [convenirá]' (Original in my possession). As almost all the worst charges against the appellants rest originally on the authority of Parsons, it is necessary to point out these things."—*Tierney*, iii. *Append.* xxxii.

proceedings, and exhorted all parties to live henceforth in a constant interchange of every brotherly aid and comfort.¹

The archpriest suppressed the breve for the space of four months! By that time the four deputies were on their road to Rome. They stopped at Paris, and got letters of protection from Henry IV. They reached the city of the pope. They found that the procurators of the archpriest had won the race, whilst they were amusing themselves and the crafty Huguenot-papist at Paris. Bitter was the fact when they discovered that the efforts of their adversaries were employed in circulating reports, alike injurious to their character and detrimental to the cause in which they were engaged. But the pope received them with kindness, and heard them with attention; for they sagaciously brought letters from the interesting "*convert*" of France, Henry IV., who, of course, befriended them, having no reason to humour Parsons in his scheme, by way of "good" for evil, in return for the brave words which the Jesuit had bestowed upon him, in his reply to Elizabeth's edict, as we have read with due "edification" and positive enlightenment. Meanwhile, however, the appellants "were opposed by a series of defamatory memorials, ostensibly from the agents of the archpriest, but really *from the pen of Parsons*; and, for nearly eight months, the period of their negotiation, they were constantly assailed with accusations of the most serious and offensive description."²

A specimen of these choice spirits is worth a whole book of mere description. Thus, the appellant Mush writes to a friend, on the 31st of March, 1602: "We

¹ Tierney, iii. 54.

² Tierney, iii. 54.

are safe under the protection of the King of France : otherwise we had been fast at the first. Parsons is very badly disposed, and strongly backed by his Society and the Spanish ; yet, I hope we put him to his trumps. He hath defamed us with the pope, cardinals, and all the town : but his credit weareth out apace, and he becometh to be thought a very Machiavelian, and not worthy of credit in any thing he railleth against us. Yet none list to displease him. We have no dealing with him, nor can he entreat us to come at the college ; which grieveth him much. Thomas Heskett, Haddock, Baines, Thomas Fitzherbert, and one Sweet, are his mercenarii, to deal against us, and spread calumnies We hear that Father Parsons writeth many lies abroad ; but trust nothing unless you hear from us. We hope very well ; for the French ambassador is a father to us Indeed, Parsons's credit decayeth, and ours increaseth : the most he doth is by lying and deceit ; and he beginneth to be spied on all hands. The great controversy between the Jesuits and Dominicans is hotly in hand now here. Will all our brethren to be of good comfort, and to stand fast together, and no doubt but we shall prevail, specially if you assist us with your daily prayers and otherwise, as every one can It goeth not well with me, that every day I must attend in courts, and yet profit little ; for all goeth *piano, piano, and friends do more than the equity of a cause*. The cardinals will scarce believe us when we tell them the last breve not to have been published in the beginning of January last. We hope shortly to have another of better quality for those points in controversy. Jesu keep you.”¹

On the other hand, “to comprehend the full force

¹ Original in Mr. Tierney's possession, iii. Append. xxxiv.

of the bitter and unscrupulous animosity with which Parsons pursued the appellants, it is necessary to turn for a moment to a memorial written by him, about this time, and still preserved at Rome. It is drawn up professedly for the information of the pope and cardinals, and is entitled, 'An account of the morals of some of the principal appellants.' After a pathetic declaration of the unwillingness with which he enters on so painful a topic, he proceeds to state the reasons that have induced him to sacrifice his feelings to the public good—calls God to witness that he has no enmity to gratify, no intention to injure the unfortunate subjects of his address ; and then at once passes to the immediate object in view—the lives and characters of his principal opponents. The parties here noticed are Cecil, Bagshawe, Bluet, Watson, Clark, Colleton, Charnock, Calverly, Potter, Mush, and Champney. Among these, however, the first place in infamy is assigned to the present deputies of the appellants. Cecil is a swindler, a forger, a spy, the friend of heretics and persecutors, and the betrayer of his own brethren. Bagshawe is a sower of sedition, and expelled and degraded student of the Roman College, a man of suspected faith and unchaste living, the author of the opposition to Blackwell, and the corresponding agent, at the present moment, between the appellants and the English government. Bluet's qualifications are of a different order. A drunkard and a brawler, he has, at one time, hurled a priest down stairs, and, at another, fallen intoxicated into the Thames. In one instance he has been prevented from murdering a fellow-prisoner only by the interference of his companions, and, in another, has attempted, but in vain, to administer the sacraments whilst reeking and staggering from the

effects of a drunken debauch. Champney and Mush—though treated with less virulence than their companions—do not entirely escape. Both, says Parsons, have been candidates for admission into the Society, and both have been rejected, on account of their impracticable tempers. Hence the enmity of each to the fathers ; and hence Mush, in particular, yielding to the suggestions of an impetuous and resentful disposition, has been led to join with the heretics against his brethren, and to assist in writing those books, which have at once defamed the Society, and scandalised every orthodox Catholic. Such is a brief outline of the principal parts of this extraordinary document, copied from the original in Parsons's handwriting, under the inspection of the late Right Rev. Dr. Gradwell. That it justifies the assertions of Mush and the other deputies, there can be no doubt : that its charges were deemed 'unworthy of credit,' we want no better proof, than that they were suffered to pass unnoticed by the pope."¹ Parsons had charged the appellants with "heretical propositions contained in certain English books." He was required to name the books in question. Thereupon he drew up a list of fourteen printed works to be censured by the cardinals. One of these was entitled, "A Sparing Discovery of the English Jesuits, lately imprinted, 1601." The following is the peroration of his remarks on this book with such a significant Catholic title :—"And here now the very multitude of these outrageous libels, with the immensity of hatred, hellish spirit, and poisonous entrails, discovered therein, do force us, against our former purpose, to cut off and stay all further passage and proceeding in this horrible puddle of lies, slanderous invectives, and devilish

¹ Tierney, iii. Append. xxxiv.

detraction ; for that the very looking them over doth weary the heart of any true Christian ; and consequently, whereas, before, we had determined with ourselves to give you some tastes or examples out of them all, yet now, finding the multitude to be without end, and the quality so base, vile, and malicious, as the venom of any lost or loose tongue, armed with audacity, and defended with impudency, stirred up with envy, and enraged with fury, and bounded noways by any limits of conscience, piety, or fear of God, can vomit or cast out, to defame their brethren,—finding this, we say, we have thought good to cease here, without further stirring the loathsome rags of so filthy a dunghill.”¹ This was written and published *after* the pope, by his breve of August, 1601, had expressly prohibited all such writings, under pain of excommunication, to be incurred *ipso facto* !² Such is a specimen of the “writings of Father Robert Parsons, which are,” says his admirer, Dr. Oliver, “characterised by masculine vigour, lucid order, and purity of diction.”³ Characteristic is this sample unquestionably—far more so than any other that might be given—because it exhibits the quality of the “fierce-natured man,” without that disguise of “piety” and “devotion” which beseeemed an Aretino as well as a Father Parsons.⁴ In his “Story of Domestical

¹ Manifestation, 94 ; Tierney, *ubi suprâ*.

² Tierney, *ubi suprâ*.

³ Collections, 162.

⁴ Whilst on this subject of the books published for the edification of the poor Catholics in England—poor in every sense of the word—I may state that they were paid for at enormous prices. Whilst the government robbed them by iniquitous taxation on their conscience, their “religious” teachers fleeced them by a tax on the very instruction which eventuated all their other miseries. Thus, for “The Anker of Christian Doctrine,” by Dr. Worthington, they had to pay “fourteen shillings”—though “it might be afforded for five shillings.” It was “sold by him at his lodging in Turnbull-street.” “The Protestant’s Apologie,” demanded “seventeene shillings”—though it “might be afforded for six shil-

Difficulties," published in 1596, Parsons had told the scandal-loving world of heretics that "the Catholics, terrified by the many and grievous moral wrecks of the seminary priests, would scarcely hold any intercourse with them, unless the latter were specially recommended by some member of the Company :¹ and now, in 1602, in his memorial against the appellants, he iterates the charge, superadding "sedition" and "ambition" to "dissoluteness of morals." "The dissoluteness of some of them," says he, "is proved by the most manifest arguments and attestations—nay, this fact is presumed to have been the very cause why many of them so stubbornly resisted the superior appointed by your Holiness—namely, lest their licentiousness should be curbed or punished by his authority, or be removed, at the request of the laity themselves, from their houses,

lings, or lesse." "The Author and Substance of Protestant Religion," sold for "six shillings"—though its trade value might be "twelve pence." "Luther, his Life and Doctrine, a railing booke," fetched "eight shillings—worth two shillings." At similar prices circulated "An Antidote against the pestiferous Writing of English Sectaries"—"The Guide of Faith"—"The Pseudo-Scripturist—a booke of some twelve sheets of paper, and sold for five shillings." And lastly, out of a numerous list of "religious" rubbish, "the lowd lying Pamphlet, termed *The Bishop of London's Legacie*, written by Musket, a Jesuite, the book containing about sixteene sheetes : they squeezed from some Romish buyers, six or seven shillings apiece. A deare price for a dirty lie. Yet I wish they that have beliefe in it, might pay dearer for it." Whether this book suggested to Cobbett his *Legacy to Parsons*, I know not ; that Legacy had the advantage in its price, if no other. For their Bibles the Catholics had to pay "forty shillings," though the trade value might be "tenne." "Sixteene or twenty shillings" they paid for the New Testament alone—though it "might bee afforded for a noble or less." See John Gee's *Foot out of the Snare*, 1624, p. 97. It certainly would have been some comfort if "the incendiary Pharisees and bellows of sedition" had worked *gratis*—or, at least, at less wages for excessively bad work, in every sense of the word.

¹ "Qui etiam (Catholici) tot, tantisque seminaristarum naufragiis perterriti, nullum ferè cum illis usum, consuetudinemque habere volunt, nisi à patribus Societatis vel voce, vel scriptis, vel denique aliquo signo, fuerint comprobati," p. 167.—*Apud Tierney*, iii. Append. p. clxi.

where they lived as they liked,—of which fact we might bring forward not a few examples, if we be expressly ordered to do so by your Holiness, although we would very unwillingly touch such unpleasant topics.”¹

When Parsons penned these charges against “some,” and then “many,” of the seculars, with the view of involving the whole body in one sweeping condemnation, perhaps he should have remembered that none complained so loudly against that method as the Jesuits themselves, only a short time before, when they were condemned and expelled from France, for the crimes of individual Jesuits merely, as it was made to appear. Be that, however, as it may : still, without for one moment countenancing Parsons’s bad motive in exhibiting the shame of his own church, there is unfortunately sufficient evidence to show that the seminary scheme was as disastrous to the morality of its agents themselves as it was calamitous to the Catholic subjects of England. The account even of an apologist painfully attests the result—not less conclusive from the summary of the *causes* of that most pitiable prevarication.

“If some priests have fallen, yet can it not be much marvelled at, considering the rigour of the persecution : but, sure, it is a manifest miracle, that, among so many, so few scandals have risen ; especially, these things considered :—First, there is no superior over any ;

¹ “Dissolutio demum vitæ in nonnullis eorum manifestissimis argumentis ac testimoniis convincitur ; imò, causa præcipua fuisse præsumitur cur multi eorum adeò obstinatè superiori à vestrà sanctitate constituto restiterunt, ne, scilicet, hæc ipsorum vivendi licentia ejus autoritate carceretur aut puniretur, aut ex laicorum ædibus, in quibus pro libito vivebant, petentibus ipsis laicis, subinde mutarentur ; cujus rei non pauca exempla proferre poterimus, si id facere sigillatim à sanctitate vestrà jubebimur ; licet inviti admodum hæc tam ingrata referre velimus.” Rough draft, in the handwriting of Parsons.—*Stonyhurst MSS.* ; Tierney, iii. *Append.* xxxiv.

every one being equal with other, and in none more power to control than in other; and, therefore, more than the law of conscience and fear of God, here is neither censure, nor other temporal or spiritual penalty, that can be, according to the ecclesiastical discipline, practised upon any (which hitherto, God be thanked, hath little needed); and so, men not standing in awe of bridles, it is marvel they keep so happy a course as they do:—Secondly, their attire, conversation, and manner of life must here, of force, be still different from their profession; the examples and occasions that move to sin, infinite; and therefore, no doubt, a wonderful goodness of God that so few have fallen:—Thirdly, the torments to priests most cruel and unmerciful, and able to daunt any man, without singular grace: and this also increaseth the marvel. In sum, where only vice escapeth unpunished, and all virtue is suspected and subject to reproach, the very use and liberty of sinning being so common, and all opportunities so ready, it is the finger of God, yea, and his strong hand and high arm, that keepeth so many and so young priests, in the flower of their age, from infinite scandals.”¹ In spite of the evident effort to “extenuate” *something*, the account of this “marvellous” writer is, perhaps, but too painful and piteous an attestation of the dismal fact in question. The account was written about four years before the period of Parsons’s animadversions. I know not whether “it increaseth the marvel,” to state that there were about four hundred secular priests in England at the time—and only five or six Jesuits to recommend the most worthy of them to the faithful, “by a hint, a letter, or a wink—*voce, vel scriptis, vel denique aliquo signo.*”

¹ Stonyhurst MSS. Ang. A. i. 70, c. ix., apud Tierney, *ubi supra*.

That was indeed a dismal epoch of "religious" history ; and throughout the whole range of that most impious of all histories, few passages, if any, can be referred to as more humiliating to humanity. Not more than a month after Parsons, in his Memorial, thus denounced the seculars, he penned a letter to Mush, the leader, with whose curious proceedings and sentiments we are acquainted.

"MY OLD FRIEND MR. MUSH.

"For that this is the vigil of the Holy Ghost, which came as to-morrow upon the first professors of our Christian religion, giving them that true divine spirit, whereby only men may be saved ; and for that no spirit is so opposite and repugnant to this, by the testimony of Christ and his apostles themselves, as the spirit of disunion, contention, envy, emulation, anger, and enmity, as St. Paul, you know, in particular, setteth down to the Galatians (*at the very cogitation whereof I confess unto you truly and sincerely, in the sight of Almighty God, that my heart trembleth whensoever I consider the danger*) ; and for as much as you and your company, having been now full three months, I think, in this city, have fled, as it were, our company and conversation, that are of the same religion and communion with you, and have been your old friends and brethren in times past, and have invited you divers ways, since your coming to the city, to more friendly and charitable meeting and dealing together, than you have hitherto showed yourself willing to embrace ;—for all these and some other considerations, which here in particular you will perceive, I have thought good, at this time (though in most men's opinions, *I be the man of all other most injured by you and your brethren, in their books and speeches*), to break this long silence, by occasion of this high and holy feast, putting us in mind what spirit we must put on and follow, if we mean to arrive to eternal salvation, and what spirit we must fly to avoid perdition, according to the plain denunciation of the apostle, *Si quis spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est ejus* [if any one hath not the spirit of Christ, the same is not of him]. And whether this be the spirit of Christ, to contend in this sort, to emulate, to envy, to fly company one of another, and to raise such scandals in our new planted English Catholic Church, that lieth so grievously under the hand of the persecutor, yea, and to join with the persecutor himself,

to help out our passionate pretences against our brethren, this, I say, is easy to consider to all them that are out of passion, for the present, and will be, at the day of judgment, to all the world, but especially to the doers themselves. Alas! Mr. Mush, is it possible that priests, illuminated once with God's grace, and brought up, for many years, in the exercise of meditation of spirit and spiritual courses, should come now by passion into such darkness, as not to see or discern these so damnable things, which every common and ordinary Catholic man, understanding the cause, doth condemn, and ery shame to our whole nation for the same.¹ . . . Neither doth it take away your obligation to lay down that passion, especially now, after so long time, and to come to some moderate and reasonable atonement with your brethren, by staying matters at home, and by discussing your controversies friendly and charitably here,² as *Christ*

¹ "With what feelings must the reader, who bears in mind the contents of the last few pages, peruse this and other similar passages of this letter! That Parsons wrote under the supposition that his practices against the deputies and their friends had escaped observation, is, I think, clear; but that he should have drawn up the charges contained in the preceding document, that, within a few weeks or days from the moment at which he was writing, he should have deliberately committed to paper the appalling accusations described in a former note, and that he should nevertheless have been able to pen such a letter as the present, carries with it something so painful, and, at the same time, so humbling, to our nature, that the mind gladly, and almost instinctively, turns from the contemplation. Yet this is not all. Only fifteen days later, we find him, under the disguise of the archpriest's agents, returning to many of his former charges, declaring, on mere suspicion, that the very men, whom he is now addressing as brothers, had instigated the late executions in England, and, in terms that can scarcely be misunderstood, entreating the pope's permission to deal with them in such a manner as to make them feel the enormity of their crime, and be thankful for any future indulgence:—*'ut cum illis qui Romæ sunt appellantes, quique totum hoc in Angliâ incendium literis suis sustentare creduntur, sic agi permittatur, ut errata sua videant saltem ac confiteantur, quò magis inde fiant idonei ad agnoscendam quaecumque Sanctitas vestra in eos postea exercuerit indulgentiam.'*"—*Tierney, ubi suprâ*, quoting Rough Draft of Memorial, in Parsons's hand-writing, Stonyhurst MSS. Ang. A. iii. 17.

² "Notwithstanding Parsons's disclaimer, in a subsequent part of the letter, I am inclined to suspect that these words betray his real motive for writing. It was already evident that the government of the archpriest would be retained: but the questions of reprimanding Blackwell and prohibiting his communication with the Society were to be discussed: Parsons felt, on these points, he was likely to be foiled; and, of course, it became an object of importance to conciliate the minds, and, if possible, to neutralise the opposition of the deputies."—*Tierney, ubi suprâ*.

commandeth all men so to do, but especially such as *offer at his holy altar daily* : and you cannot but remember the dreadful threat of his apostle against them that receive there his body unworthily ; which unworthiness both himself, and St. John, and other saints, so hold, as you know, to be in the highest degree in him that is *in hatred, enmity, contention, envy, or emulation with his brethren*. Wherefore, I do most heartily beseech you, Mr. Mush, and the rest of your fellow priests there with you, even for the love of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, giver of all good spirits, and for reverence of the Holy Ghost, whose happy and blessed coming is celebrated to-morrow, that you consider well with yourselves what spirit leadeth you and yours in this contention, whither it tendeth, what lamentable effects it hath wrought already, and doth work daily, in England, by the breach there made among Catholic people, what scandals have fallen out and do fall out continually, *beyond your expectation or wills, I am sure* ; this being the nature and condition of divisions and contentions once begun to break out farther and to fouler effects, than the authors, at the beginning, did imagine ; whereof, notwithstanding, they remain culpable both before God and man, if they seek not to stay them in time : and you must remember that *it will be but a small excuse to posterity for so great mischiefs, to say you were put in anger or rage by others, and much less defence and excuse can it be with God, at his tribunal, whose just dread ought to possess us all*.¹ Neither must you think or say, as men are wont to do that love not peace, that this is written for any other end, but only *to put you in mind of this present holy feast*, and of all our duties therein, to look to the spirit whereby we are guided, and to take the course which Christian Catholic priests ought to do. . . . God's holy spirit inspire you to take and use it, to his glory and your own good ; to whose holy benediction I commend you and yours, and myself to all your prayers.

“ From the English College, this Whitsun-eve, 25th of May, 1602.”²

¹ The preceding italics are Mr. Tierney's, to exhibit Parsons's *verbal* attestation in favour of his opponents, I suppose :—the present italics are mine, and are meant to draw attention to the important fact that these “religious” leaders always “had eyes but saw not”—that they knew their duty well enough, but perversely chose the *worse* part. Away, then, with the usual and absurd excuse about “the times in which they lived.” It was their duty to reform by example, not to confirm by imitation, the worst features of the times. Unquestionably *their* conduct excused the same manifestations in the vulgar herd of men—their wretched scapegoats the people ; but these leaders knew good and evil as well as the devil who practised on Eve.

² “ When, in addition to what has already been said, it is further stated that,

Meanwhile the pope and the cardinals, to whom the matter was committed, began, as was likely, to "be full weary thereof, to see so great clamours raised upon so small grounds, and so obstinate contention about things of no substance," as Father Parsons expresses it, in another letter, written on the same day as the foregoing—but, of course, in quite a different strain—being intended for the eyes of a partisan. Although written on the very same day on which he penned the foregoing adjurations, this "religious" man found a conscience to misrepresent the whole affair—in a strain that proves anything but the sincerity of the aspirations with which he celebrated his Whitsun-eve.¹

The first demand of the seculars was the appointment of bishops—doubtless as much to conciliate Elizabeth as to save themselves from the Jesuits. Then they petitioned for six archpriests, with other officers, to be annually or biennially elected by the clergy; but neither of these plants could possibly take root, or if they did, they were soon starved by the contact of noxious weeds: the "enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat," or, as Mr. Tierney expresses the fact, "in both these points they had been foiled by the superior address

almost at the very moment when Parsons wrote this letter, he was publishing his 'Manifestation'; that, in that work, the deputies, who are studiously confounded with Watson, are assailed with the most unmeasured abuse; and that the very person who is here addressed in terms of friendship, is there sneered at as having been originally 'a poor rude serving man,' received and educated by the Jesuits in the English College, out of charity, and afterwards by the appellation of Doctor Dodipol Mush, the reader will scarcely be surprised to learn that the present epistle, as well as two others, subsequently addressed, the one to Mush, the other to all the deputies, in the same strain, was suffered to lie unnoticed."—*Tierney, ubi suprâ.*

¹ See the letter *apud* Tierney, *ubi suprâ*, and Tierney's annotations, which last *never* represent Parsons in any other light than that deserved by an arrant dissembler, and unscrupulous machinator.

of Parsons.” Nevertheless, in their complaints against the administration of the archpriest, and in their efforts to vindicate themselves before the pontiff, they were more successful. Another breve was issued, condemning the conduct of the archpriest, and justifying the appellants from the charges of schism and rebellion. It declared that the archpriest Blackwell, by his censures and decrees, had exceeded his powers ; that the appellants, by their resistance to his authority, had never forfeited their spiritual faculties. It limited the archpriest’s jurisdiction to the priests educated in the foreign seminaries ; forbade them, in future, and for the sake of peace, to communicate either with the superior of the Jesuits in England, or with the general of the Company at Rome, on the concerns of his office. It commanded him to supply the first three vacancies that should occur in the number of his assistants, with persons selected from amongst the appellant priests ; and, having ordered him to receive and transmit all appeals to the cardinal protector, it concluded by condemning the past, and prohibiting all future publications, in any manner connected with the present controversy.¹

¹ Tierney, *ubi suprâ*. The intercourse between the English government and the appellants, and the assistance afforded by the former to the latter, in the prosecution of their appeal to Rome, soon attracted the observation of the Puritans ; and the ministers were openly charged with abetting popery. “To remove the scandal,” says Mr. Tierney, “Elizabeth published another proclamation for the banishment of the Catholic missionaries,” Nov. 5, 1602, which I have before stated : but surely this proclamation was rather caused by the plot concocted by Catesby, Tresham and Winter, under the auspices of Garnet, to induce another Spanish invasion at the close of the year 1601, as I have related, quoting Mr. Tierney himself—iv. 7, *et seq.* And the probability is enhanced by the fact, that she permitted the appellants to remain, provided they would present themselves “before a lord of the council, the president of Wales, or the bishop of the diocese, and shall there *acknowledge sincerely their allegiance and duty to her.*” I have before enlarged on the subject.

“Thus terminated this unhappy contest,” observes Mr. Tierney, “leaving behind it, however, a rankling feeling of jealousy and dislike, which cannot be too deeply or too lastingly deplored.” To which we can but say Amen ! Still we must not fail to observe likewise that this result, so painful to Parsons and his faction, was most probably owing to the patronage of the French king, by the intervention of his envoys : so that the “credit” may fairly be awarded to Parsons and his men, that their calumnious machinations failed of their bad success, by reason only of royal patronage. In effect, D'Ossat was then at Rome : we have read his interesting letter to Henry IV., respecting Parsons and his scheme : it was actually written during the struggle. Unquestionably D'Ossat saw nothing in these machinations to make him more “enamoured” of the Jesuits than he had ever been ; for it was very shortly after this contest that he wrote to Villeroy, alluding to their recall into France, saying :—“Now, however, after having considered many things which I have read and heard of them, I declare to you that I will meddle no more in their affair ; and I resign it once for all, to what his majesty and council will judge for the best,”—as a very bad piece of business.¹

The denunciation of the plot with which the secular priest Watson was connected, was a sort of loyal vengeance, as well as a piece of political dexterity on the part of the English Jesuits. They consigned that guilty secular priest to the scaffold ; and working out their own punishment, connected themselves with an

¹ D'Ossat wrote these sentiments in January, 1603, and the breve in favour of the appellants, was issued by Clement VIII. in October, 1602. I have quoted D'Ossat's letter before, p. 53 of the present volume.

infinitely more atrocious conspiracy, with which their name will be branded for ever, and with justice.

As may be expected, the penal result of the Powder Action was redoubled persecution for the wretched Catholics of England, who assuredly had no share in the transaction. It may be little to the purpose to state, that the pope then reigning, Paul V., discountenanced that conspiracy, and endeavoured to avert its horrible inflictions ; for the principles whereon that plot was based, were essentially papal, had been upheld by all his immediate predecessors, were too deeply rooted in bad hearts by the pangs of persecution on the one hand, and by the exhortations of fanaticism on the other, to be upturned by a prohibition at the last hour, when all was ready, or in a state of energetic preparation. Glorious, indeed, would it have been for papal integrity, had there been made to the English government, a papal denunciation of that "great blow" which was to render the Catholic cause triumphant. Doubtless the conspirators knew, as was the fact, that the pope had been induced to imagine, that a negotiation would succeed with the Scoto-English monarch in the midst of his hungry partisans, and that by such "peaceful and safer events," (as spoke the pope by Aquaviva) the wretched condition of the Catholics might be bettered. They also knew that the attempt would be futile, and went on stuffing their flaming dragon with powder and the "wrath of God." Garnet, as we have read, announced something like a fixed resolution in certain parties, to right themselves in spite of papal prohibition ; there was enough in that fact, if no more had been communicated, to induce a Christian sovereign, not to say the "father of the faithful," to notify the impending danger

to a royal brother. There may be much to extenuate, much to excuse this indirect participation of the pope and Aquaviva in the Powder Action; but those excuses—that extenuation—when thoroughly sifted, still leave behind the numberless abuses of the religious sentiment—the chaff that covers them—and among them we must assign the first place to papal supremacy, the leading “idea” in the Catholic movement. Indeed, this idea was so prominent among the Catholic divines then most in vogue, that we need not wonder to find James I. making it the excuse for his dreadful measures against the Catholics; for I do not believe that the discovery of the Powder Action was necessary to eventuate *his* persecution. His cruel, as well as ungrateful treatment of the Catholics before the plot, was certainly a natural cause, co-operating with the spiritual “idea” of Allen’s priests and the Jesuits, to produce those desperate results whose only end was redoubled calamity to the Catholics,—a bitter thought, that whilst, as a body, they were loyal, they were made to atone for the crimes and principles of those who had constituted themselves their leaders. I have here coupled the priests with the Jesuits, because, although possibly less guilty, they nevertheless contributed to the general proscription of catholicism in England, as essentially the source of treason to the sovereign and the realm. And assuredly no pagan tyrant ever surpassed, nay, ever equalled James I. and his government, in their unspeakable atrocities against the Catholics.

How ferociously did the “Protestant” mind then invent its lucrative precautions against popery! As soon as the Parliament assembled after the Powder Action, all was animation—that animation which prevails

amongst the vultures of the desert over carrion. The first demonstration was entitled "An Act for the better discovering and repressing of popish recusants." "Assuming that, amongst the Catholics, there were many who, to conceal their real principles, occasionally repaired to church, it began by ordaining that all recusants convict, who should already have conformed, or should hereafter conform, should, under a penalty of twenty pounds for the first, forty for the second, and sixty for every subsequent, omission, be bound, in addition to their attendance at divine service, to receive the sacrament, once at least every year, in the parish church. It then gave to the king the right of refusing, if he should think proper, the usual fine of twenty pounds per lunar month, for absence from church, and of taking, in its place, the whole of the personal, and two-thirds of the real, estate of the offender."¹ Then an oath was framed, to be taken by Catholics, as a test of their allegiance—against all the doctrines connected with the leading idea before mentioned—papal supremacy in all its ramifications. This oath was contrived chiefly by Archbishop Bancroft and Christopher Perkins, a renegade Jesuit. It had its intended effect, which was, to divide the Catholics about the lawfulness of taking it—to expose them to daily prosecutions in case of refusal—and endless misrepresentation, as disaffected persons, and of unsound principles with regard to the government.² Eighteen was the prescribed age for taking the oath: women who refused to swear it, if married, were to be imprisoned in a common gaol—all other individuals were subjected to the penalties of premunire, or anything and everything short of the penalty of

¹ Tierney, iv. 67.

² Dodd, iv. 70.

death. It was treason to give or receive absolution in confession—even beyond the seas! It was a penalty of 10*l.* per month to receive a visitor, or keep a servant who neglected to attend the service of the church. And another bill went forth, exceeding in cruelty all that had hitherto been devised for the oppression of the devoted Catholics. Pursuing them from the cradle to the grave, it entered into all the walks of life, it cast its shadow on the sacred privacies of every home, and, affecting its victims in all their varied capacities of husbands, wives, parents, children, patrons, executors, guardians, and members of the learned and liberal professions, in all and each it subjected them to penalties of the most grievous and inhuman description. Catholics were banished from the precincts of the Court: they were forbidden to remain within ten miles of the liberties of London, or even to move more than five miles from their residence, until they had made oath as to the cause of their journey, and obtained a written license from the neighbouring justices, the bishop, and lieutenant of the county. Catholics could not be lawyers, physicians, apothecaries, judges, clerks, stewards—in a word, they were debarred from every office of trust or emolument in the commonwealth. If the Catholic wife of a Protestant husband was convicted of not having received the Protestant sacrament in the parish church, during the year preceding the death of her husband, she was condemned to forfeit two-thirds of her dower—was deprived of her interest in two-thirds of her jointure—and rendered incapable either of acting as executrix to her husband, or of claiming any portion of her husband's property. If the child of a Catholic was not baptised by a Protestant minister, its parents were fined 100*l.*

All children sent abroad, all Catholics going beyond the seas, without special license, were, by the very fact, divested of all their rights of inheritance, legacies and gifts included—until they returned and swore the oath of allegiance:—meanwhile the next *Protestant* heir enjoyed their property. And the Solomon of England goaded the cruelty of this so-called Protestant parliament by his “meditation” and suggestions against the “papists, old, rooted, and rotten,” as he called them—who were “to be sifted by oaths.” “Take care of marriages and christenings,” he said—“Nip them in the bud—the beginning of procreation, the action—priests in hold [in prison] to be banished within a time—after that, the law to be executed with all severity.”¹ Such was the tail-piece of the Powder Action, to the Catholics—a product scarcely less horrible—a worthy child of the “monstrous, rare, nay, never-heard-of treacherous attempt,”—for, when we contemplate the ramified iniquity of those enactments, it requires no casuistry to decide the preponderating guilt of those who, under the pretext of a crime intended by a few desperate wretches, inflicted such frightful vengeance on the whole body of Catholics, whose innocence of the plot the king had acknowledged.

Then ensued the famous contest amongst the Catholic leaders, as to the legality of taking the oath of allegiance, concocted by the Protestant archbishop and the renegado Jesuit. Father Parsons, ever on the watch for his prey, seized the opportunity for vengeance. As soon as the oath was mentioned—before it had been adopted by Parliament—and consequently before he could have known what it really contained, Parsons addressed a

¹ Journals of the House of Commons, i. 265 ; Tierney, iv. 67—69.

memorial to Bellarmine, declaring that the oath was actually taken from the writings of *the appellant priests* ! He requested the cardinal not only to compel Cecil and Champney, two of the appellants then at Rome, to subscribe and send to England a written protestation against the oath, but also to exert his influence in procuring a formal sentence, declaring the doctrine which denied the temporal authority of the pope, to be false and heretical. And this unprincipled man went further still : he blushed not to state his reasons for advising these measures against Cecil and Champney. It is not the doctrine contained, or supposed to be contained, in the oath ; it is not the necessity of counteracting the effects of the alleged writings on the subject ; but actually that the king may be induced by this forced or entrapped demonstration of the appellants, to withdraw the partial indulgence which he is supposed to have conceded to some of the seculars—in order that, on this subject at least, the king and his council should have an equal motive for *unsparing severity against all*.¹ In effect, however, Blackwell himself, the archpriest, “submitted to the oath” or “pronounced in favour of its

¹ Tierney, iv. 70. “ Accioche, visto [il scritto] del rè e delli suoi consiglieri, intendessero che tutti sacerdoti sono del medesimo parere in questa materia, e così non potrebbero perseguire l'uni più che l'altri per questa causa.” See the Memorial apud Tierney, iv. Append. xxiii. Parsons actually states that the identical oath was presented by the agents of the archpriest in 1602, to the Inquisition, and that the appellants had promised to condemn its doctrine—had failed to do so—nay, had spread the doctrine “in the thousand books in the hands of the Catholics, making an impression on many.” He presented the memorial in the name of Harrison, the archpriest's agent, and had the conscience to conclude with saying that “the poor, most afflicted Catholics would feel obliged to Bellarmine for this *good office*”—and states that he has named in the margin the eleven or twelve books containing the doctrine alluded to—and, of course, the substance of the oath to be denounced—though he knew nothing of its nature. His letter is dated at Rome, May 18th, and the bill containing the oath was not passed until nine days after, in London.

lawfulness," and took it in the following year. Several of the clergy and laity followed his example. But when a copy of the oath was sent to Rome, two breves, or apostolic letters, were directed by his Holiness to the English Catholics, condemning the oath as unlawful. Several recanted upon this intimation ; but still there was a party that not only stood to their former resolution, but confirmed the practice by learned treatises, which they published on the subject. These called forth replies, both at home and abroad, from the missionaries and foreign divines, who opposed the oath of allegiance, or its peculiar denunciation of the papal prerogatives. Bellarmine, Parsons, and other Jesuits, were the leading manufacturers of arguments against the test, whilst the Catholics in England literally "knew not what to do," in the confusion of their leaders and guides unto destruction. Some of them prepared to leave the kingdom, flying from the rushing storm of persecution—whilst many, roused to energy by the cruelty intended to oppress them, flung aside the indifference which had hitherto concealed their belief, and boldly avowed their religion to the world. Still, "there wanted not individuals, who, to escape the new penalties, were willing to comply with many of the provisions of the new statutes."¹ The lawfulness of the oath was the grand contention. The clergy were divided in their opinions. Some maintained that it might be taken as it stood—others that reservations or protestations might be adopted to save the pope's authority—whilst a third party denounced it unconditionally. And, of course, there was not wanting a Jesuit, Father Nicholas Smith, who "held that the whole oath might be taken with

¹ Thus, according to Boderie and Mr. Tierney, but stronger avowals are forthcoming on this important *time of trial*.

equivocation, because he thought no part of it was against faith.”¹ What is most curious in this lamentable confusion of tongues, is, that the archpriest was, at first, amongst the most violent opponents of the oath—resisted every effort, whether of reason or persuasion, in its favour, until “suddenly a new light flashed upon his mind, and he at once became as zealous in its advocacy, as he had before been vehement in its condemnation.”² New lights are always admirable ; but their construction and chemical analysis should always be given, in order to enhance our admiration of the beautiful result. It appears, then, that the archpriest was completely worn out by his troubles and the contentions, with which he was surrounded in his venerable old age. “Some more effectual order were needful,” wrote the Jesuit Holtby to Parsons, “to stay so many wanton and presumptuous wits, as, upon a conceit of learning and sufficiency where it is not, do attempt and set abroad their errors and scandalous inventions at pleasure. Neither will or dare the archpriest deal with such ; his powers being so limited, as he saith, and himself disgraced by former proceedings, that they bear no respect unto his office or person : whereby I do think him so discouraged that he list not to meddle with any belonging to his charge ; but rather live in obscurity, and suffer all to run as they list—albeit in the oath I found him too forward.”³ And in point of fact, the archpriest seems to have made a virtue of necessity ; for only listen to the same Jesuit urging that “our humble suit must be directed unto Signore Paul [the pope], in the greatest scandal and

¹ Letter of Mush, apud Tierney, iv. Append. xxxiii. ² Tierney, iv. 73, note.

³ Stonyhurst MSS. Ang. A. iii. 71, apud Tierney, *ubi supra*. Holtby writes under the assumed name of North, Oct. 30, 1606.

downfall that, this many years, hath happened, or could come unto our nation, or have blemished the glory of our springing revived church." "So it is," says he, "that, partly by the doctrine of approving the oath, and much more of allowing and *defending* our long-aborred church-going, we are brought into that estate, that we fear, in short time—*ne lucerna nostra prorsus extinguatur* [lest our lamp be completely put out]. Neither let our friends think that we speak this, to amplify the matter; for, no doubt, the case is more lamentable than we could have imagined or expected; for now, not only weak persons here and there, upon fear of temporal losses, do relent from their constancy, but whole countries and shires run headlong, without scruple, unto heretics' churches to service and sermons, as a thing most lawful; being emboldened thereunto by the warrant of their pastors and spiritual guides, who, upon a sudden, it seemeth, voluntarily, and presuming upon their own wits, daily degenerate into false prophets or wolves,—*quorum Coripheus est ille Thomas Carpentarius, vel Wright, de quo jam aliàs sæpè* [whose ring-leader is that Thomas Carpenter, or Wright, concerning whom I have often elsewhere enlarged]. And lest that his doctrine might be suspected, for want of authority, he is contented to authorise and confirm the same by his own example:—and it is verified among them,—'*si videbas furem, currebas cum eo; et cum adulteris portionem tuam ponebas*'" [when thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers].¹

This is certainly no very favourable account of Catholic orthodoxy in England, after the boastful operation for

¹ Apud Tierney, iv, Append. xxiv.

so many years, by Allen's preservative priests and the Jesuits. In effect, all the Catholic peers, with the single exception of Lord Teynham who eluded it, repeatedly and spontaneously took the oath in the House of Lords;¹ and in the first year, there were only 1944 recusants out of the whole Catholic population—the vast majority of whom were of the lower ranks (to their honour be it recorded, in their conscientious refusal, if such it was)—there being among them only two knights—one of whom afterwards conformed—three esquires, and forty-five gentlemen.² These last facts bear hard upon the Jesuits, for it was their boast that the gentry and nobility were exclusively under *their* guidance.³

We must, of course, remember that the Jesuit, Father Nicholas Smith advocated equivocation in the very delicate matter. And here we may pause—and be permitted to ask this important question—of what moral or “religious” advantage have these missionaries and Jesuits been to the Catholic cause in England? The lamp which they had lighted up—or rather, the incendiary strife they had roused—with incalculable calamity to the scape-goat Catholics, was likely to be utterly extinguished in the moment of vigorous persecution. What the desultory severities of Elizabeth could not effect, the money-screwing, persevering Scotchmen achieved without difficulty—driving the scape-goats of the priests, monks, and Jesuits, to abjure the grand idea, papal supremacy—yea “whole countries and shires, headlong, without scruple,” to the churches and sermons

¹ Tierney, *ubi suprâ*, and Lingard, ix.

² Recusant Papers, No. 437; Tierney, *ubi suprâ*.

³ Tierney, *ubi suprâ*, referring to Parsons.

of the Protestants—perhaps the most humiliating feature of this general prevarication. But, in excuse of these wretched Catholics, I ask, how could it be otherwise? Their “pastors and spiritual guides” led the way: they who started originally with fervid opposition to this very “long-aborred church-going” now give a “warrant thereunto,” and that, too, “voluntarily”! Thus did that selfish, rash, bad scheme eventuate its own humiliation—its own retribution. And it is very pleasant to behold the result. It is very pleasant to see proverbs come to pass—saying that “Confidence in unfaithful men in a time of trouble, is like a broken tooth, and a foot out of joint.” In fact these men “troubled their own house,” and consequently, they “inherited the wind,”—a most appropriate portion for the roaring bellows of sedition.

Meanwhile, the English Jesuits in Flanders, feeling quite secure in their snug colleges, resolved to speculate on the vocations for martyrdom that might still be lingering among the dying lamps of the church in Britain. They urged the pope, Paul V., to lay aside his forbearance towards the English monarch. Henry IV. of France, on the contrary, admonished the pope to cling to conciliating measures, to refrain from every exasperating demonstration, to give no pretext to James for the adoption of measures which might ultimately prove fatal to the existence of the Catholic religion in England.¹ Under the disguise of messenger from the Duke of Lorraine, a secret envoy was dispatched by the pope to England, with letters to the archpriest, prohibiting all seditious and treasonable practices, and to King James, soliciting his interposition between the indiscri-

¹ Tierney, iv. 74; Boderie, i. 150.

minate vengeance of the legislature, and the unoffending body of the Catholics. James affected a kind reception to the envoy, gave him the gratuity usual on such occasions, but dismissed him with words signifying nothing for the pope.¹ So far the pope had complied with the request of the Roman Huguenot ; and when he found that James had his reasons for pursuing his scheme against the Catholics, the pope should have still kept the politician's advice, or if he wished to be doing something, he should have resorted to masses, fastings, scourgings, litanies, and Jesuit-novenas ; in short, to anything rather than "make bad worse." But unfortunately, as the evil genius of the English Catholics would have it, almost at the very moment when the envoy returned to his master, two Jesuits, the deputies of the Belgian province, arrived at the Roman court. They brought an address to the pope : they came "to rouse him to the adoption of some speedy and energetic measures against the English king."² Paul was not disposed to resist the stirring appeal. He struggled a moment—human nature got the better, or, rather, the worse of him—and, in that evil hour, "he yielded to the clamours by which he was assailed." He signed a breve, forbidding all Catholics to attend the Protestant churches, and pronouncing the oath to be unlawful—"containing many things contrary to faith and salvation."³ So far Mr. Tierney : but this unconscionable Jesuit-ridden pope actually delivered himself as follows to the Anglo-Catholics :—"Wherefore we admonish you, altogether to refrain from taking this and similar oaths—which conduct we the more intensely exact from you, because,

¹ Lingard, ix. 76 ; Tierney, *ubi supra*. ; Boderie, 284, 300, 327.

² Tierney, iv. 74.

³ See the breve, apud Tierney, iv. Append. xxv.

having experienced the firmness of your faith, which, like gold in the furnace, hath been proved in the fire of your perpetual tribulation, *we know* that you will cheerfully endure more atrocious torments whatsoever, yea, will firmly seek death itself, rather than offend, in anything, the majesty of God. And our confidence is confirmed by the daily reports which we receive of your great virtue and fortitude, which, not otherwise than at the beginning of the Church, shine forth in these times, in your martyrdoms.” Now, compare this arrant balderdash with the Jesuit Holtby’s account of affairs, written about nine weeks before the pope made himself the mouthpiece of this most unreasonable and cruel misrepresentation. Recall to mind “the greatest scandal and downfall that, this many years, hath happened,” “the blemished glory of our springing revived Church,” “approving the oath,” “defending our long-abhorred church-going,”—in fact, “the lamp put out,”—“whole countries and shires running headlong, without scruple, unto heretics’ churches, &c.,”—through “fear of temporal losses,” “without scruple,”—yea, “as a thing most lawful,” “emboldened by the warrant of their pastors and spiritual guides,”—the “false prophets or wolves.” Now, was it not too bad to call upon men who had the good sense, at least, to eschew martyrdom on the fair principle that “When doctors disagree, their disciples are free,”—to call upon such men, I say, “cheerfully to endure more atrocious torments whatsoever, yea, firmly to seek death itself, rather than offend, in anything, the majesty of God,”—which majesty was nothing more than the despicable pretensions and prerogatives of the Roman pontiff? The whole affair was evidently the contrivance of the religious demoniac Parsons, whose

implacable hatred of the appellants made him reckless of means to involve them in the general ruin of the English Church. What he wished Bellarmine to do, even before he knew the nature of the oath, is now achieved by his faction, and the result was according to his heart's desire.

The breve was conveyed to the archpriest, Blackwell, by the very Jesuit, Holtby, whose description of the English church has just been contrasted with its foreign misrepresentation. Blackwell would not publish the instrument, for, as he candidly said, "he would not thrust his head into the halter wilfully."¹ His caution was a back-wind to the Jesuits in England—"I would to God," wrote one of them to Parsons, "that the customer [the archpriest] would inform of all such matters as belong to him : for his silence doth argue a kind of neglect of the points ; and our information maketh us more hated of the estate and secular priests."² Thus was their wicked craft punished by itself. It was, doubtless, by *their* "information" that the government heard of the breve's arrival. From the first, James had been made acquainted with the fact that the Jesuits were the machinators of the instrument ; and he now proceeded to manifest his resentment by ordering the oath to be indiscriminately administered to all Catholics.³ This proceeding was downright, unjust folly :—he should have confined his indignation to the priests and the Jesuits, but mostly to the latter—not, indeed, by the horrible penalty of death, but simply by ejectment—by a positively universal, incessant, scouring of the land,

¹ See his Fifth Examination, Tierney, iv. Append. xxvi.

² Blount to Parsons, Dec. 7, 1606, apud Tierney, *ubi supra*.

³ Boderie, i. 201 ; Tierney, iv. 74.

driving out the pernicious incendiaries back to their pope — meanwhile lavishing every kindness on his Catholic people—raising them from their crime-generating degradation—and encouraging that tendency to sensible loyalty, which they had begun to exhibit. The penalty of death should have been utterly discarded. He might be sure that it would be styled “martyrdom,” and would generate a positive necessity for the repetition of the criminal absurdity. Utter contempt is the most effectual extinguisher of calculating rogues under the cloak of religion. Had Elizabeth or James published an edict menacing to brand the incendiary Pharisees, with the initial letter of Rogue on their foreheads, a single sample would have had the effect like that of letting loose a tarred rat in a barn infested with the vermin. James resorted to the usual Roman and Spanish method—for two bad reasons, bigotry and *want of money*.

As the King of France had predicted, the persecution raged with renewed fury. Two priests were apprehended and condemned to death, for returning into the realm ;—but they were spared at the intercession of the French ambassador and the Prince de Joinville. A third, who happened to have in his pocket a letter written by Parsons against the oath, was executed on that account, without mercy—in spite of the entreaties of the French ambassador. Was that fact a pang, or a consolation to the ruthless Jesuit hectoring afar? He probably shrugged his shoulders—and wrote another letter :—for his jackall in England wrote to him, saying : “These naughty priests afflict us very much ; for, besides Skidmore, the Bishop of Canterbury’s man, Rouse, Atkinson, Gravener, and other relapsed, which openly profess to

betray their brethren, others are no less dangerous, which persuade a lawfulness of going to sermons and to service, by which means many worldlings, to save their temporals, are contented to follow their counsel ; and not only that, but justify the fact also.”¹ It is necessary to state that this letter was written to Parsons by Blount, about three months after the date of the papal breve, i. e., the Jesuit breve, Parsons’s breve with the pope’s sanction. And in the council of Father Parsons, it was woe to “these naughty priests !”

As the Jesuits had stirred up this new pretext for the Scotchman and his people, to persecute the Catholics, so were they the first to wish for peace once more, being in constant peril of their lives. The plan they devised for propitiating the king, seems to have been suggested to them by a fable of Æsop misunderstood, the one in which a man tries to propitiate a savage dog by throwing him a bone :—of course it proved but a premium on the dog’s ferocity—but the ferocity of the government was attributed to the right motives, when the Jesuits offered to buy exemption from martyrdom, with a sum of money. Humiliating as is the imputation to the government, it is, nevertheless, most gratifying thus to find that these Jesuits and others perfectly knew that the religion of Protestants had nothing in reality to do with the persecution. By offering a bribe, they showed their estimate of the base motives which led to the lucrative persecution. “You shall understand,” writes Jesuit Blount to Parsons, “that the Lord William Howard and Father Blount are now busy with the ambassador of Spain for money, upon condition of some kind of peace with

¹ Blount to Parsons, *ut antea*.

Catholics : whereunto we are moved by *the lord chamberlain and his wife*, promising faithfully that some good shall be done for Catholics. The ambassador is willing to concur with money. What the end will be is very doubtful ; because *Salisbury* [of Garnet-notoriety] will resist : *yet such is the want of money* with the chamberlain, at this time (whose expenses are infinite), that either Salisbury must supply, or else he must needs break with them, and trust to this refuge. Besides, the chancellor doth much desire to thrust out all the Scottish, of whom they begin to be afraid ; seeing now by experience that, if the Catholics go down, the Scottish step into their place ; for which cause, the very Puritans in the Parliament say plainly, if they had thought the Scottish should have had *the forfeitures, the laws should not have been passed.*" (!)¹ Little more is wanting to display in all their bearings the policy and attitude of the "Protestant" party, at the time, as opposed to the "Catholic" party—both actuated by precisely the same motives—utter selfishness varnished with their respective "religion." "All heats about prerogative and privilege were now laid aside : the pulpits and our universities rang with declamations against the heresies and usurpations of the Church of Rome ; and now the king gave himself wholly to hunting, plays, masques, balls, and writing against Bellarmine, and the pope's supremacy, in arrogating a power over kings, and disposing of their kingdoms But whilst the king was thus wallowing in pleasure, he wholly gave himself up to be governed by favourites, to whom he was, above any other king of England (except Henry VIII.) excessively prodigal, not only in honours and offices, but of the revenues of

¹ Blount to Parsons, *ut antea*.

the crown, and aids given in Parliament, and these being of both nations, Scotch as well as English, made them to be the more intolerable :—all things being at peace abroad, public affairs were neglected or scarce thought of, whilst the Dutch still grew more powerful at sea, and without any aid from the king, were matches for the King of Spain by land ; and Henry IV. of France was accumulating incredible treasure at home, and laying the foundation of vast designs abroad, whereof the king took no notice—his genius lying another way,”—namely, “ hunting, plays, masques, balls, and writing against Bellarmine and the pope’s supremacy.”¹

Of course the Jesuits took care to notify the general disregard paid to the papal breve. No one doubted its origin, and many suspected its authenticity in consequence : if many refused, many consented to take the obnoxious oath. Another breve was expedited. What a contrast in the wording ! The pope is made to pretend to think that he was quite astonished at the result—*perturbavit sanè nos hic nuncius*. And, as a matter of course, he shifts the blame from the good sense of Englishmen, to the everlasting devil, to whose “ craft and fraud ” the papal breve attributes their transgression.² And the pope confirmed the preceding instrument, and enjoined all Catholics to accept and abide by the previous prohibition—one of those spasmodic perversities for which resisted churchmen have ever been so famous.

Ere the breve reached England, the archpriest had fallen into the hands of the pursuivants, and was in prison ; and he had not only taken the oath, but had

¹ Coke, Detection, i. 49.

² See the Breve, Tierney, iv. Append. xxviii.

also, by a public letter, recommended his people to follow his example, in the plainest terms of earnest exhortation, saying :—" So shall we shake off the false and grievous imputations of treasons and treacheries : so shall lay Catholics not overthrow their estates : so shall we effect that which his Holiness desireth, that is, to exhibit our duties to God and our prince,"—which last was evidently not the result literally flowing from the papal breve. Bellarmine and Parsons pounced on the poor old gentleman, urging upon him " the grievousness of his transgression." All to no purpose whatever. " He had sworn," he said, " in the sense of the law-giver : he had sworn in the sense avowed by himself, and accepted by the magistrate : he had denied, not the spiritual authority, but the temporal pretensions, of the pontiff, and, in so doing, he was warranted as well by the decisions of divines, as by the necessity of alleviating, if possible, the sufferings of his persecuted flock." He was consequently deposed from his office, and Birkhead was appointed archpriest of the distracted Catholics. Blackwell, now in his seventieth year, languished in prison till his death, in 1613.¹

Then it was that *Maître Jacques*, the Solomon of England, sailed into the Babelmandeb of controversy. By the help of his divines, he got up a tract, entitled " An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance," and, by way of fortifying the argument, six priests were condemned and three of them executed at York and Tyburn.² Parsons and Bellarmine betowed answers to his Apologie, and distracted his royal brains with their buzzing controversy. Again he closeted himself with his divines, revised his lucu-

¹ Tierney, iv. 75 ; Lingard, ix. 77 ; Boderie, ii. ; Butler, ii.

² Lingard, ix. 78 ; Boderie, iii. ; Challoner, ii.

bration, prefixed to it a "Premonition to all Christian Princes;" but, changing, improving, disputing, debating with his theological oracles, he could come to no satisfactory result, capable of fronting the two Jesuits on the contemptible field of controversy. Henry IV. pitied Master Jacques, and advised him, for the sake of his dignity, to desist from a contest so unworthy of a royal head. The King of Denmark offered the same respectable advice; but, whilst the pedant was sagacious enough not to insult the King of France for his admonition, he presumed to administer castigation to the little King of Denmark, telling him to blush for his folly in offering advice to a prince so much older and wiser than himself. The queen tried to check the royal infatuation of her husband, but in vain, and turned her displeasure against Salisbury, whom she suspected of encouraging her husband in this pursuit, that he might govern the kingdom at his pleasure. No doubt, however, that James's notion that he knew more theology than all the doctors in the world, was sufficient without the least encouragement from his crafty flatterers. Difficult was the parturition, however; and, at the moment of birth, the new "princely gift" was suppressed; a new light had shot through his brain—he called in the copies, again revised, corrected, and altered the trifle,—after softening down the argumented assertion that the pope was Antichrist, which title he now declared contingent on the continuance of his pretensions to temporal dominion over princes. To various princes of Europe he sent copies of his book, by special messengers:—most of them accepted it as a compliment: but the King of Spain and the archduke peremptorily refused the royal platitude—which their political

bigotry should have permitted them to receive with a smile of commiseration.¹ How different was the beautiful gratitude of Matthews, the Archbishop of York, who actually threw himself upon his knees to receive his copies from the messenger, kissed them, promised to keep them as the apple of his eye, and to read them over and over again—a memorable display of devotion which he probably never vouchsafed to his Bible. And then began the mighty battle of croaking frogs, singing their old and everlasting war-song in the swamps of controversy. Protestant divines, Romish theologians, Jesuits and seculars, scribbled their foolscap with astonishing vigour and fertility—the former under the wing of the royal bird—not the *eagle*—the latter under the cloak of Bellarmine and Parsons. The controversy continued to agitate the Catholics during the greater part of the seventeenth century, and still left the ridiculous question about papal supremacy, to die that natural death which, in the course of time, never fails to extinguish, or at least to render innocuous, the pernicious or absurd concoctions of ignorance and craft.²

But James had to do with crafty antagonists—veteran controversialists, who never scruple to resort to every and any expedient for the subversion of an opponent. The reader is aware of James's early connection with the Catholics, the Jesuits, the King of Spain, and the Pope of Rome,—a connection as insincere and crafty on *his* part, as it was crafty and calculating on the part of those who thought they could entrap the Scotchman into

¹ It was full of dissertations on the vials in the Apocalypse, which made the French ambassador declare that the book was “the silliest and most pernicious that was ever written on such a subject.”—*Boderie*, iv. 302; *Lingard*, ix. 79.

² *Lingard*, ix. 78, *et seq.*; *Boderie*, iv. 319; *Winwood*, iii.; *Birch*, 298, *et seq.*; *Dalrymple*, *Memorials*, p. 13; *Tierney*, iv. 75.

their treasonable scheme against Elizabeth. The intriguers were first punished, as we have seen—by the utter failure of all their schemes and machinations. This was precisely as it ought to be :—but the craft and tricks of the Scotchman deserved punishment, no less ; and it was now inflicted, the more intensely because in the very exultation of his despicable vanity. Bellarmine published a letter written by the king himself, to Pope Clement VIII., in 1599, in which he solicited the dignity of cardinal for a Scottish Catholic, and subscribed himself—*Beatitudinis vestræ obsequentissimus filius. J. R.*—“Your Holiness’s most obedient son. James R.” This was a stroke for which James was not prepared. At first he sank under it,—convicted of duplicity or perfidy in the eyes of all Europe. As his only resource he determined to deny the fact. Balmerino, his secretary at the time, was summoned before the council ; and after several examinations, at the last of which the king attended unseen, yet within hearing, he consented to acknowledge that he had artfully procured the royal signature to the letter, but at the same time had kept his sovereign in ignorance both of its contents and of its address !¹ Such was the deed, and such was the infinitely more disgraceful artifice resorted to, in order to cover the humiliation of the “Protestant” King of England, now undertaking to prove the pope to be Antichrist.

¹ Lingard, ix. 398. “He (Balmerino) confessed simulatly, as was thought by those that best understood the court, and how matters then went, to liberate the king of such grossness.”—*Balfour*, ii. 29. See Lingard’s conclusive remarks and facts against the credibility of the king’s denial, and the artifice contrived for his exculpation. Of course there is nothing wonderful in the original application to the pope : we shall soon find a much more modern Protestant king of England lending himself to a similar transaction.

Meanwhile the great body of the Catholics smarted for this madness of their spiritual and temporal rulers. Blackwell's example, in taking the oath, had been followed by several among the clergy, and by numbers in all parts of the kingdom. By the majority of the clergy these persons were regarded as schismatics, and were refused the benefit of the sacraments ; they applied to Blackwell and the other prisoners in the Clink, and obtained what the opponents of the oath had withheld. Thus a schism was formed in the suffering remnant of the Catholic church in England. The new archpriest, Birkhead, threatened to inflict the penalties of disobedience to the papal mandate : he was disregarded by the dissidents : their resolution remained unshaken. "Obedience was not the question, they said : the oath was lawful in itself : the declaration of the pope was insufficient to render it unlawful. Irritated by the publication of the breves in his kingdom, the king enforced still more vigorously the oath of allegiance : three priests who refused to take it, were condemned to the gallows. The archpriest naturally shrunk from the responsibility of aggravating the resentment, thus awfully manifested against his brethren. Yet the zealots of his communion urged him to proceed. The more violent charged him with abetting "the Clinkers," or prisoners in the Clink ; the more unscrupulous, or reckless, hesitated not to carry their accusations to Rome, and denounced both him and his assistants, as the approvers of the oath ; and, in spite of all his representations, deprecating the horrible consequences to the Catholics, he was compelled to proceed against the dissidents, and to declare that they were deprived of their faculties."

The pecuniary penalties for recusancy were rigidly

enforced ; but this did not satisfy the fanatical Protestants, and in 1610, all Catholics were ordered to quit London within a month, and all priests and Jesuits were commanded to leave the kingdom within the same period. The Oath ! The Oath ! or your money ! was the universal summons of the legal footpads and highway robbers. “ If matters proceed in execution as the Parliament hath defined, there will be no means for a Catholic to live in this realm. They must now pay for their wives 10*l.* a month. Every fortnight the justices are to offer the oath ; which I fear, will cause a number to stagger. All justices must be sworn to execute the laws against us. Men must bring in their recusant wives (noblemen to the bishops, and all other to the justices) ; and so be put in prison, and *their husbands shall have free liberty to relinquish them !*”¹

Strongly as we must abhor and denounce these iniquities on the part of the government, still, can we be blind to the remorseless iniquity of Rome and the Jesuit faction, for *their* share, their instrumentality in pouring these vials of wrath on the wretched Catholics of England ? They appealed to the pitiless Moloch. “ In the most affecting terms,” says the Catholic Tierney, “ eight clergymen, prisoners in Newgate, described the sufferings endured by themselves and their people, for the refusal of the oath. They spoke of the gaols crowded with inmates, the scaffolds flowing with the blood of victims. They implored the chief pastor, by the blood of the martyrs and by the bowels of their Redeemer, to take pity on them in their affliction, and to specify those parts of the oath which rendered it unlawful to be taken.

¹ Fragment of an original letter by Birkhead, apud Tierney, iv. 77.

To this appeal, so touching, so just, so reasonable, *no answer was returned.*"¹

The Jesuit Gaston Pardies describes an experiment which consisted in cutting up a certain insect into various pieces, in order to prove the independent and organic vitality of each separated portion, which still continued to move, after the cruel dissection ; and the Jesuit tells us that "he has often tried a similar experiment with much pleasure."² I believe that the case exactly applies to Pope Paul V., to Parsons and his faction, in their pitiless conduct towards the Catholics of England. And did they "think they had a good conscience," the while ? *God* only knows ; but I doubt the possibility. They, "with necessity, the tyrant's plea, excused their devilish deeds."

Nor was it only in making trouble in eventuating calamity for the Catholics and their clergy, that the bad

¹ Tierney, iv. 78. "The court of Rome, as Bossuet observes, was afraid lest explanation might overthrow its claims to temporal jurisdiction (*Defens. Declar. Cleri. Gallic. lib. viii. c. xxiii.*) ; and James, therefore, was still left to upbraid the pope for a silence, as unwise in regard of the government, as it was injurious to the interests of the Catholics :—'In this respect,' says the monarch, 'he hath dealt both indiscreetly with me, and injuriously with his own Catholics ;—with me, in not refuting particularly what special words he quarrelled with in that oath ; which, if he had done, it might have been that, for the fatherly care I have, not to put any of my subjects to a needless extremity, I might have been contented in some sort to have reformed or interpreted those words : with his own Catholics, for either, if I had so done, they had been thereby fully eased in that business, or, at least, if I would not have condescended to have altered anything in the said oath, yet would thereby some appearance or shadow of excuse have been left unto them for refusing the same ; not as seeming thereby to swerve from their obedience and allegiance unto me, but only being stayed from taking the same, upon the scrupulous tenderness of their consciences, in regard of those particular words, which the pope had noted and condemned therein.' (*Apologie for the Oath*). Whatever may have been the insincerity of James, it is painful to reflect on the truth of these remarks."—Tierney, iv. 78.

² De la Connoissance des Bestes, p. 90. "J'ay fait souvent une semblable expérience avec bien du plaisir." Ed. Paris, 1678.

passions of the rough-natured Parsons were displayed : the rival missionaries of England, the Benedictine monks in Spain, experienced the jealous rancour of his heart, in ceaseless opposition, and he found eager abettors in his Company. So determined was the opposition made to these monks in their design of establishing a mission in England, that they found it necessary to appeal to the doctors of Salamanca, for a declaration that they were competent, as monks, to preach salvation to the Catholics of England—a prerogative which the Jesuits would confine to themselves and those whom they hoped to govern as they listed. It was decided in favour of the monks : but this only tended to increase their opposition, and made them louder in their complaints. They appealed to the nuncio. They addressed the people. They called on the council of state to interfere and prevent the establishment of the proposed mission ;—and it was not until the cardinal archbishop of Toledo, after a careful examination of the several charges made by the Jesuits, had pronounced the allegations to be false, and the design of the mission to be meritorious, that they could be induced to suspend their hostility, and permit the scheme to be carried into execution.¹

Parsons was sinking into the grave ; but he was himself to the last ; and his last public displays against his own religionists was strikingly similar to the treatment he experienced at Oxford, out of which he emerged a Jesuit. The Benedictines of Douay awakened the jealousy of the Company, and Parsons resolved to “swindge” and “trim” them in his usual style of unmeasured abuse and imputation. Like the wolf in the fable, he said, “they hated the Jesuits—that they had

¹ Tierney, iv. 88.

slandered the Company." The fact was, that Parsons and his Jesuits coveted a monopoly of the mission. The monks appealed to the pope in a memorial, proving that the statements of Parsons were either false or frivolous ; and they were fortunate enough by their patronage, at least, to get a verdict from the pope, who issued two decrees, confirming their establishment at Douay,—enjoining both parties to lay aside the memory of past dissensions, forbidding the Benedictines to withdraw the students from the seminaries, and prohibiting the Jesuits from dissuading or hindering them from joining the monks—the two everlasting bones of contention among these martyr-making evangelists.¹

It must be remembered that, with the exception of Douay College, all the seminaries for the sacerdotal supply of the English mission, were under the direction of the Jesuits. A certificate from the rectors was required to attest the qualifications of the candidates, and thus the clergy were placed in subjection to the Jesuits. Those rectors were frequently changed, and

¹ Tierney, iv. 88. By way of a specimen of the spirit which actuated these men, take the following in a letter written by a Dr. Singleton, a partisan of the Jesuits, on the affair of Douay : " You must understand that the Benedictines in England receive, as they call them, many *donates* in England, and omit nothing to make themselves populous and a great multitude, *imagining to do by numbers what they cannot by virtue*. There is, at this time, come over about bishops, Dr. Smith and Thomas Moore, and another who went away by Rouen to Father Bennet, a Capuchin, to draw him to their bend . . . They are desperate ; for they give out that they will not return homeward to England again, unless they prevail. It is thought that they are accompanied with my Lord Mountacute's letters (and God grant not others!), to deal for the removing of the fathers [the Jesuits] out of England ; and are to make large offers, from those which never intend to perform any of them, to compass what they desire. These men are yet but at Paris, in their journey : with them Mr. Doctor Norton is to encounter [*i. e.* the appointed opponent on the Jesuit side], who, for that purpose, is either gone, or to go presently, from Pont-a-Mousson towards Rome. We, here in Flanders, provide to prevent their intended plots, by our letters with the first post."—*Apud Tierney*, iv. Append. xl.

thus certificates were obtained from persons attesting the fitness of candidates whom they had never seen. Even at Douay, though ostensibly under the clergy, the Jesuits contrived to give the law. It was governed by a Dr. Worthington, well known as a blind and unyielding partisan of the Jesuits—a man who had placed himself by a vow at the absolute disposal of Parsons,¹ and therefore was promoted to the government of that seminary by the interest and direction of that Jesuit. It was a significant prelude of the usual consequences when this new president proceeded at once to discard the actual confessor of the house, and to substitute a Jesuit in his place. By degrees, the old professors were removed, by the direction of Parsons: the ancient institution of theological lectures was abolished: youths, only just emerging from their studies, were taken from the schools and thrust into the chairs of divinity; and, whilst men, notorious for their party predilections, were associated with the president in the management of the

¹ This Dr. Worthington, writing to Parsons, in 1597, thus announces the fact on which he doubtless speculated for advancement: "I appointed myself two years for probation, to the imitation of your Society, meaning and purposing, in the end of the same two years, to bind myself by like vow unto your reverence, as before I had done to the good cardinal [Allen]; which vow, this last feast of the same St. Thomas, I have confirmed (I thank God for it) by vow and promise to God—in *manu confessorii*—[in the hands of my confessor], who was the rector of your college in Louvain, who only knoweth this my vow as yet, and no other mortal creature And as for your accepting of this charge over me, I told my said ghostly father that I would now signify it unto you, and desire you so to accept me, and that I trust that, of your charity, you so will; if not, I will, notwithstanding, for lack of your direction, endeavour to follow your inclination, so far as I can learn it, in all mine actions of importance. He advised me to write my vow, and keep it with myself; which I have done, and here declared to you the sum and substance thereof. Now, in all dutiful humility, I beseech you, for God's sake, thus to accept me into your particular charge, to direct, command, and govern me, as your subject in God."—*Original, apud Tierney, v. Append. v.* During the dispute concerning the Jesuit Holt, this Worthington "acquired some unenviable notoriety," says Tierney, v. p. 5.

house, a negotiation was actually opened, or believed to have been opened, with a view to surrender the establishment to the Company.¹

In the meantime, the effects of these and other innovations, introduced under the authority of this clerical Jesuit, were already exhibited in England. Subjected to no probation, trained to no discipline, the scholars were, in many instances, dispatched "with the hasty gleanings of a few weeks' or months' instruction, to enter on the duties of the mission."² As they came without learning, so they not unfrequently came without virtue and without religion. Scandals of course ensued. The enemies of religion looked down with triumph on what was passing: the *adversaries of the clergy* pointed to the weaknesses or delinquencies of their brethren, and, mingling truth with falsehood, exaggerating some things, insinuating others, carefully omitting to specify the names of the accused, sought to create a prejudice against the whole body of the secular priesthood." Thus writes the Catholic historian, but I must inform the reader that by "the adversaries of the clergy" he means the *Jesuit* faction in England. "Unfortunately," he continues, "they were but too successful. The Catholics, filled with a vague suspicion of danger, gradually closed their doors against every member of the clergy, with whom they were not personally

¹ Tierney, v. 5, with authorities.

² Tierney, v. 6. He says that the diary of Douay College furnishes abundant instances of this, and subjoins a few. "John Farmer received the sacrament of confirmation on the 22nd of March, 1605; three days later, he was admitted as an alumnus of the house, and received the four minor orders: on the following day he was made sub-deacon; on the 9th of April, deacon; on the 24th of the same month, priest; and on the 16th of May, he was dispatched to England on the mission."—*Diary*, i. 80, 82, 83. The other instances are precisely similar.

acquainted. To increase the evil, Dr. Worthington, from Douay, still continued to pour in his illiterate recruits. During the four years ending at Christmas, 1608, no less than forty-one priests were sent on the mission from the single college of Douay alone. It was in vain that the archpriest remonstrated ; it was in vain that he pointed to the misery with which he was surrounded, to his inability to relieve the necessities of his present subjects, and to the danger of exposing men to want, in the midst of the persecution with which they were encompassed. Month after month fresh supplies of useless labourers arrived. Idleness and destitution, the necessity by which they found themselves compelled to live in the public hospitals, amongst the most dissolute characters, were now added to their other misfortunes. A feeling of recklessness grew up among many of them : apostacies and immoralities followed ; and all the evils, resulting from the degradation of its ministers, seemed about to descend upon religion.”¹

¹ Tierney, v. 7. “Coguntur vivere in publicis hospitaliis, inter dissolutissimæ vitæ personas.”—*Mem. apud Tierney*. One of these hasty recruits, who was admitted at Douay in June, 1605, was ordained priest in the following December, and soon after sent on the mission, fell into the hands of the pursuivants, apostatised, became a servant in one of the cathedrals, committed an “odious felony”—and perished on the gallows. “A monstrous scandal it was,” says Birkhead, the archpriest, “yet known to very few in these parts. If he had been relieved at the first, he had never played that part ; but finding no relief at all, he conversed at the first with heretics, and amongst them was debauched, and protested at his death that he was never infected with that abominable sin, until he joined with them.”—*Orig. apud Tierney*. But surely it was not necessary in those days to go and learn that “odious felony” and “abominable sin” among the *heretics*. The most modern curiosities on the subject will be found in Potter’s “*Mémoires de Scipion de Ricci*,” i. c. xiv. ; and Borrow’s “*Bible in Spain*,” c. xvii.—“*Heretics*” have nothing to do with these instances. It appears that the Jesuits in England managed to finger “the great gobbets” of the collections made for the missionaries. When the priests applied for aid, they were told that the alms were to be bestowed “only upon the fathers.” This was particularly unfortunate if it led to the above calamities.

Is it possible to conceive a state of affairs more wretched and desperate! The whole body of the Catholics proscribed and tormented by the Protestants—eager to devour their substance and their souls: their spiritual guides blinded by partyism and the spirit of faction—or fettered by the Jesuits in the name of the pope—or sunk into that most dismal state of humanity, when poverty loses its self-respect by consenting unto crime. Yet have all these bitter calamities been entailed upon the Catholics of England by the missionary scheme of Allen, and the introduction of the Jesuits—to restore and “preserve” the religion of Rome in Britain. Step by step, link by link, the Catholic sorrows of England advanced, and were fastened upon the nation, with the progress of the senseless, the infatuated, the cruel speculation. It is now high time to come to a right conclusion—to form a right judgment on these historical facts, so important in the consideration of man’s destiny. In truth, to those who bitterly have asked, and still demand, Why are the results of Christianity everywhere so inconsistent with the example of Christ—the answer must be sought—not in the Christianity of Christ—but in that endlessly involved patchwork of sacerdotal, ecclesiastical, or church-selfishness, which has victimised humanity for ages. Who—which *party* will throw the first stone at *this* adulteress?

Neither persecution, nor poverty, nor vice could reconcile the Catholic parties of England among themselves. There seemed to be the curse of Cain upon the speculation—the curse of endless unrest, bitter enmities, that peculiar rancour which is the immortal child of religionism—irrational, petulant, reckless. Again the idea of getting a bishop among them, and thus getting

rid of Jesuit-domination, rose up to torment the seculars. In 1606 they sent two deputies to Rome to negotiate the transaction, on which they built the most sanguine hopes of deliverance from their woes,—simply because they had not as yet tried the experiment. “To Parsons,” says the Catholic historian, “to Parsons their arrival seemed to threaten the destruction of all his designs. In the first instance, indeed, he had adopted the scheme of an archpriest, for the purpose of promoting a political object. That object had failed; James had been quietly seated on the English throne; and Parsons, who had since been seeking to propitiate the monarch, might reasonably have been expected to abandon a device, *intended originally to exclude him*. But it is not thus easily that men are inclined to relinquish an advantage. If the project of an archpriest had failed in its political aim, it had, at least, insured independence to the body of which Parsons was a member. To revert now to an episcopal form of government, would have the effect of curtailing this independence. It would place the Jesuits, as well as the other regulars, under the control of the canons; and would thus materially affect their position and their influence among the Catholics of England. It was necessary, therefore, to resist the application, which Cecil and Champney, the two agents, were to make. Instead, however, of discussing their arguments, or debating the subject of their request, Parsons resolved, *as usual*, to assail their characters, and, if possible, to deprive them of the opportunity of executing their mission. With this view, therefore, he began by drawing up a memorial, to be presented to the pope as the address of the archpriest’s agent. In it, he denounced

the two deputies as the enemies of religion, spoke of one, in particular, as the calumniator of the Holy See ; and concluded by praying that Cecil, at least, might be immediately seized by the proper authorities, and compelled to give security for his appearance, to answer the several charges that were about to be preferred against him. Other memorials, in the same style and from the same pen, speedily followed. As students, it was said, the parties in question had been distinguished for their turbulence : as missionaries, they had been known only for their constant and familiar intercourse with the enemies of their faith. They were the friends of *heretics* : they were the agents and the emissaries of heretics : to heretics they had already betrayed the counsels of the Holy See ; and to heretics they would again become the useful instruments of mischief, unless, to prevent it, they were now placed upon their trial, and dealt with according to justice and the laws.¹ It does not appear that Parsons was gratified, in this instance, as in that of Bishop and Charnock, with the adoption of the extreme measures which he here suggests. But his principal object was obtained : the petition of the deputies was rejected ; and, for the present at least, the hopes of the clergy were once more defeated.”²

Still undiminished raged the furies of the mission. It was a night-mare dream fearfully realised—and Parsons was the incubus. The archpriest was placed between his seculars on the one hand, and the redoubtable Jesuit on the other—to the former he pledged himself not to consult the Jesuits in his government, as the papal breve had expressly stipulated—and yet to

¹ Parsons's Memorial to Paul V. The MS. is in Mr. Tierney's possession, and is published in his History, v. Append. v.

² Tierney, v. 10, *et seq.*

Parsons, it seems that he turned as conscious weakness turns to the terrible and remorseless attraction of a powerful but unscrupulous mind, whose will is indeed magnetic, electric, that is, incomprehensible. Entrapped by the fascination, which he could not resist, his conscience, as usual, suggested that the restrictions placed upon his predecessor, with regard to Jesuit-consultation, might not be binding on himself; and he wrote to Parsons stating his "doubt" and demanding *his* decision in the case of conscience. A "probable opinion" sped to the conquest. "Parsons saw that the opportunity had now arrived, for which he had long been waiting. In a letter, filled with expressions of the warmest attachment to his correspondent, he promised him to lay the matter before the pope, and in due season to acquaint him with the result. In the meantime, he exhorted him to dismiss his scruples; assuring him that, by consulting the fathers in the affairs of his office, he would contravene neither the intentions of the late, nor the wishes of the present, pontiff; and finally engaged that, if, by his conduct, he would prove himself a constant adherent of the society, the latter would employ the whole weight of its influence and of its means, to support him against the efforts of his opponents."¹ Now his "opponents" were his own secular priests, so eager to get rid of the Jesuits. "Birkhead gladly caught at the specious assurances of his friend, and instantly agreed to adopt his suggestions. A correspondence on the affairs of the clergy was now regularly opened with the fathers. At home, the superior of the Society was consulted on all matters of moment: at Rome, every letter and application to the Holy See passed *open*

¹ Tierney, v. 14.

through the hands of Parsons, to be delivered, or suppressed, as he might judge convenient,”—just as the Jesuit-pupils and novices are compelled to do, in their little correspondence! “As a confirmation of this fact, it is not, perhaps, unworthy of remark, that the same custom of sending all official communications through Parsons, existed during the administration of Blackwell. I possess many of that superior’s letters, which have all evidently passed through this channel; but one in particular, now before me, too remarkable to be left unnoticed. It is addressed to Cardinal Farnese, and is written for the express purpose of obtaining a reversal of that part of the papal breve, which had forbidden all official communication between the archpriest and the Jesuits. It is dated on the 17th of October, 1603, rather more than twelve months after the prohibition had been in force; and yet, to show how daringly the commands of the supreme pastor could be defied, the seal is actually that of the secretary of the Society, and its address is in the handwriting of Parsons himself!” Again, “About the year 1606, Lord Montague had forwarded an address to the pope, praying for the appointment of bishops. This paper had been entrusted to Parsons, but had not been presented. Montague afterwards heard and complained of its suppression; and Parsons, who had not only suppressed, but had also opened the letter, declared, in justification of the fact, that he was consulting the safety of Montague (!) and had only withheld the document itself, in order to lay its contents more briefly and more effectually before the pope. It is singular, however, if this were the case, that Parsons should have suffered two years to elapse, without communicating the matter to Montague, and that the latter,

who received no answer from the pope, should have been left accidentally to discover what had occurred.”¹

The clergy remonstrated against the connection between the archpriest and the Jesuits : they reminded him of his engagements, and the mischiefs that would ensue from their infringement—but their remonstrance and their predictive suggestions were in vain. “Secure in the protection of the fathers, he thought that he might defy the expostulations of his own body ; and, for some time, the mission seemed to have been placed at the absolute disposal of the Society.”²

Soon, however, the archpriest was again afflicted with doubts ; but now their object was the pit into which he had fallen—Parsons and the Company, who said unto him, “All these things will I give thee, if, &c.” His conscience told him he was “led by the blind.” The clergy resolved once more to “try” for a bishop. Parsons foiled them again : after a variety of small skirmishing, he induced the pope to decree that “until every member of the clergy should concur, not only in petitioning for an episcopal superior, but also in recommending the particular individual to be preferred to that dignity, no proposal on the subject would be entertained.”³ If the end of the world depended on such conditions, it would certainly be doomed to roll for ever with all its “imperfections on its head.” Nevertheless, a mission to Rome from the clergy was resolved, touching the whole state of affairs—the abuses prevailing in the seminaries, the ignorance, incompetence, and the multitude of missionaries, who only disgraced the clerical body. A great-grandson of the venerable More, the

¹ Tierney, v. 14, *et seq.* I need not state that Mr. Tierney publishes documents in attestation.

² Tierney, v. 15.

³ *Ibid.* 19.

celebrated Chancellor of England, was associated with the secular agent. When Parsons found that he could not prevent the mission, he resolved to play another game, which consisted in "playing off" the miserable seculars, who could never "cope" with Father Parsons. "He now came forward to greet the envoy on his arrival, and to offer him, for the usual term of eight days, the accommodation and hospitality of the college. Smith, the envoy, accepted the offer, and availed himself of the opportunity to unfold the nature of his commission. He exhibited his instructions: he explained the different points on which he was about to negotiate; and he besought the father to co-operate with him in the prosecution of a suit, as essential to the interest of religion, as to the establishment of harmony among the several members of the English mission. But it was soon evident that Parsons, though he engaged to support, was really determined to counteract, the efforts of his guest."¹

Smith obtained an interview with the pope, and pleaded the cause of the afflicted Church of England, with great truth as well as earnestness; made some impression on the holy father, and easily obtained, on the spot, the confirmation of the prohibition against Jesuit-interference in the government of the archpriest. Parsons was alarmed: but he expressed satisfaction at the decision, and resolved to set it at defiance, "with feelings of deep and unqualified mortification." "Albeit I perceive . . . that you esteem yourself bound to have less intelligence with me and mine than heretofore, in respect of the late order, procured from hence by your agent; *yet do I not think that I am* ANY WAY restrained from writing or dealing with you thereby."

¹ Tierney, v. 21.

Thus wrote Parsons to Birkhead, the archpriest.¹ And he kept his word : he “proceeded at once, with renewed and undisguised energy, to counteract the efforts of the two envoys. *As usual*, his first step was to assail the character of the principal agent. With this view, he began by composing two sets of letters, both addressed to Birkhead, but one framed for the purpose of being communicated to the clergy, the other written under the strictest injunction of secrecy. The first spoke of his attentions to Smith, and of the harmony in which he was living with the clergyman : the second described the agent [the same man] in the most unfavourable terms, represented him as the friend of the appellants, and as a person already tainted at Rome with a suspicion of heterodox notions, and, finally, endeavoured to impress the archpriest with the belief, that, in selecting this man for his representative, he had committed himself to the hands of one who would readily sacrifice him to his own passionate conceits. The object of these and other letters was evidently to induce Birkhead to recall Smith, and thus to terminate the present negotiation.”²

The man who was acting this deceitful part had only a few months more to run ere he would appear for his final judgment : in about six months more and Robert Parsons would be dead.

His scheme did not succeed : the obnoxious agent was not recalled. “Another, and it was hoped a more effectual, course was now adopted. A body of slanders, written from England by Holtby, the resident superior of the Society, was eagerly collected : parties were employed to watch the conversation, and to register every unguarded expression of the agent ; and, while

¹ Tierney, v. 24, note.

² Ibid, 24.

his writings were searched for matter of cavil and denunciation, memorials, charging him with maintaining unsound opinions, and with holding secret intercourse with the enemies of religion in England, were drawn up and presented to the pope.”¹

Whilst Parsons was thus treasuring up his future merits for the laudation of the biographers, his men “in England were actually offering a bribe to the archpriest for the purpose of detaching him from the cause of his clergy! Writing to Smith, on the 14th of December, 1609, and speaking of the slanders with which he has been himself assailed, Birkhead says: ‘Yet, for all this, I am not dejected; for I have no intention but for peace. You will not believe what fair offers have been made me of late, *to relinquish you all*; and how *well I should be maintained, in greater estate, &c.* This hath been offered to me, this last term, by a lay gentleman whom I will not name: but, God willing, all the gold in the world shall not remove me from the course I have begun, unless Paul (the pope) will have it otherwise.’”²

And yet, the general of the Jesuits, Aquaviva, had *expressed* to Smith an unqualified approval of all the demands in litigation—and *none* of the Company made “show of resistance”—even Parsons himself still preserved his impenetrable hypocrisy—and the duped agent continued “to advise with Parsons on the several points to be submitted to the pope.”³

¹ Tierney, v. 24. Here is a specimen by the Jesuit Holthy to Parsons May 6, 1609. “Poor recusants are still ransacked by the bishops’ pursuivants. One Finch, a *priest*, is joined with them; and some four or five more, *not yet discovered*, are *said* to be intelligencers for the bishops, and to give notice of all they know: whereof Leak is named for one, a *principal factor* for bishops, with Mr. Colleton, Mush, R. S. (Smith) Bishop, and others. My Lord of Canterbury looketh daily for news of R. S.’s negotiations.”—MS. in Mr. Tierney’s possession.

² Tierney, v. 26.

³ Ibid.

At length the bitter conviction flashed through his mind—that conviction which should be felt but once in a man's life—deception on the part of those in whom we have confided without reserve. “He saw that, in private he was opposed, in public he was crossed and disappointed : he felt that the object of his pretended counsellor was to obstruct or defeat his mission ; and he resolved, at length, to adopt the letter of the papal mandate, and abstain entirely from their conferences. For the same reason, Birkhead, also, by a formal instrument, subsequently relieved him from his connexion with Fitzherbert [the Jesuit-jackall of Parsons], and thus left him free to pursue his negotiation immediately with Paul himself. But, unfortunately, the power of his opponents was too active and too daring to be successfully resisted. Supported by Blanchetti, the vice-protector, they were enabled, as it were, to surround the papal throne, and thus to frustrate every appeal, which he addressed to the consideration of the pontiff. It was to no purpose that he invoked the aid of the supreme pastor : it was to no purpose that he described the miseries of the clergy, and the ruin of their colleges, and the disgrace and the scandals that were hourly falling upon religion. Even to a request that no presentations to the seminaries should be valid, unless made with the joint consent of the archpriest and the superior of the Jesuits in England, *no answer* was returned—month followed after month ; memorials and audiences succeeded each other ; but the art or the misrepresentations of his enemies perpetually intervened ; and when, at length, a tardy decision was pronounced, it was only to stigmatize the subject of his entreaties as an innovation—to tell him that, although a trifling modification in the manner of

obtaining certificates for degrees might be permitted, the other and more crying evils, resulting from the ignorance of the clergy, and from the reckless haste with which they were poured into the country, would still be maintained.”¹

Only one remark need I append to this disreputable transaction—and it is this :—What we have read—all *these* “awful disclosures,” are not items of the *Monita Secreta*, or secret instructions of the Jesuits so famous and infamous,—but undeniable facts, which, however, *no* item in that book is too bad to represent or suggest.

I believe that Robert Parsons has been faithfully described in these pages, thanks to the truthfulness of the Catholic historian who has given the damaging documents to the world. Nor has Tierney failed, on any occasion, to express that natural indignation, which must be felt at the discovery of unblushing falsehood, and that foul iniquity which shrinks not from the blackest calumny, to crush an opponent. Whatever further disclosures this historian may have to make, in the last volumes of his history, may confirm, but they cannot deepen, the disgust which we have been compelled to feel with the character of Robert Parsons. “To the services of Parsons,” says Tierney, “to his comprehensive mind, and indefatigable energy in the foundation and management of many of the foreign seminaries, the world will continue to bear testimony, in spite of all his failings. Yet his existence was not necessary to the greatness of his Order. Its glory needs him not : and, without detracting either from his merits or his powers,

¹ Tierney, v. 26, *et seq.* Again, let it be remembered that Mr. Tierney upholds every statement with its documents.

the disciples of Ignatius may still assure themselves that their body hath many a worthier son than he."¹ And so we must, in charity, hope and desiderate.

Early in the following year after the transaction which we have just read, this terrible man of religious war expired. Death summoned him away quickly. No scene is given by the Jesuits—excepting that Aquaviva and other members of the Jesuit-aristocracy paid the veteran a visit ere he breathed his last. Had he lived just a month longer, he would have seen that king whom he had denounced, *Henry IV.*, murdered by a fanatic.

It cannot be doubted that the murder or the deposition of Elizabeth was ever the desire of his heart.² There may be critics who will excuse the man by "assuming" his zeal in the cause of his religion. By

¹ Tierney, iii. 55.

² Winwood wrote to Cecil from Paris in 1602, stating that Charles Paget (the *Catholic*, but an opponent to Parsons, as we have read) had acquainted him "that he had received an information, that about the 11th of August there departed from Rome an English Jesuit, whose name he knoweth not, of the age of thirty years, a man of good fashion, of a sanguine complexion, a yellow beard, of a full quick eye and middle stature ; who furnished by the Spanish ambassador with a sum of money, did take his course towards England, with purpose there to attempt against her Majestie's person. He [Paget] made much difficultie to name his author ; but because I urged Sir James Lindsey, who within these two days arrived to this town from Rome, he acknowledged him to be the man, but so that I would promise to conceal his name. As he saith, Sir James Lindsey hath seen the man, who passing by him on a time, when he was walking with Parsons the Jesuite, Parsons willed him to behold him well, and asked him whether, if he should meet that man in England, he would take him for a Jesuite." . . . In another letter, dated October 20, 1602, Winwood writes as follows :—"By the means of the ambassador of Scotland, I have spoken with the partie [Lindsey] this morning, from whom he received the advertisement which I sent. . . . He averreth the same, by many protestations, to be true, and addeth moreover, that Parsons did very earnestly and often deal with him to receive that man into his company, whom above all other marks he noteth to have a high nose, and to pass through Scotland into England."—*Winwood Memorials*, i. 442, *et seq.*

this assumption, they overlook the fact that they shift the weight of iniquity from the man to his cause, which could suggest such atrocious and utterly unscrupulous means to achieve its triumph. The zeal of Robert Parsons was displayed in endless endeavours to foment and keep up an irreconcilable enmity between the kingdoms of Spain and England, and thus to incite the Spaniard to invade England and Ireland. It failed in the issue. He damaged the Catholic cause in England. He damaged the reputation of his Company. Amongst the wisest men of his own communion—Cardinal D'Ossat, for instance—he passed for an impostor, as reckless and desperate, as his scheme was ridiculous. And his scheme may be said to have ruined the kingdom of Spain. When the Almighty's elements, and the fleets and the veterans of Britain in the days of Elizabeth, had crushed the power, extinguished the glory, and humbled the pride of the Spaniards, of what consequence was it to the Catholic cause, that "their malice had neither bottom nor brink?"

On the other hand, it is well known that much of the disreputable conduct of Parsons was instigated by the other Jesuits of his faction. They "stirred" him incessantly, by reporting the obloquy which he had merited among his opponents of the other Catholic faction.¹ The world has been frequently the maker of bad public characters: friends and foes combine to fashion those portents who, "by necessity, the tyrant's plea," have desolated humanity. Unfortunately, in Robert Parsons, there were, originally, precisely the very elements adapted for such a creation. The spirit of his faction "brooded"

¹ See Tierney, iv. Append. cxl. for an instance of this, and Tierney's apposite reflection thereon.

over that chaos : it said, "Let there be *darkness*"—and all was dark accordingly. And, as usual, his faction helped to make him ridiculous as well as guilty. At the death of Allen, they resolved to make a cardinal of Robert Parsons. Headed by the Jesuit Holt, they set on foot a petition to the King of Spain, signed by the "common soldiers, labourers, artizans, and pensioners, nay, scullions, and laundresses, as well as by those of better rank and quality. Upon this, Father Parsons makes haste out of Spain to Rome to hinder it, as the Jesuits say for him. When he came thither, upon a day set him, he waited on the pope, and acquainted him how the city was full of discourse of his being shortly to be made a cardinal ; and that Spain and Flanders rung with it too ; and therefore begged of him that he would not think of making him a cardinal, who might be more serviceable, in the condition he was now in, to the affairs of England. The pope told him, that the King of Spain had not written a syllable to him about any such thing : and that he must not mind foolish reports ; and bid him go and mind his studies."¹ The reader remembers what he has already read on the subject. Parsons was probably a consenting party, at least to the scheme, and only "overdid the thing," as is usual with overcrafty leaders. Pope Clement VIII., however, was more in the secret than he fancied. The truth appeared that the pope had received many complaints of him from the secular clergy, and instead of introducing him into the sacred college, had some thoughts of stripping him of the posts which he already possessed.² In fact he was

¹ Gee, *Introduction*, 54 ; Watson, *Quodlibet*, 120 ; Bayle, viii. 153. The pope's reply is given even by the Jesuit More, *Hist. lib.* 6, but is sagaciously omitted by the other Jesuit, Bartoli.

² Chalmers, *Biog. Parsons*.

virtually banished to Naples by the pope, or by his general, as we have seen, and he vainly petitioned for permission to return to Rome, remaining in exile until the death of Clement, a few years after. This result was certainly a bitter humiliation to the pride of his heart; "the cardinal elect" was overwhelmed with gibes and scoffing, and doubtless the pang tended immensely to aggravate that rancour which he ever felt and exhibited against his secular brethren of the English apostolate. The pope embraced his scheme, but, as it appears, had cogent reasons to reject its designer: these reasons were never imparted even to Parsons himself—though he earnestly craved the information—"who are the causes, to wit, Spain, France, the pope, &c.,—how long it is meant,—what I may answer to them that do urge me in that point."¹ There were, doubtless, many reasons—and none of them in the least creditable to Father Parsons.

Berington, the Catholic priest, calls Parsons "the calamity of the English Catholics."²

The same Catholic authority gives the following forceful summary of the Jesuit's "merits and powers."

"To the intriguing spirit of this man (whose whole life was a series of machinations against the sovereignty of his country, the succession of its crown, and the interests of the secular clergy of his own faith) were I to ascribe more than half the odium under which the

¹ Stonyhurst MS., apud Tierney, iv. Append. cv.

² Mem. of Panz. Introd. 83. "So obnoxious was Parsons to the government, that on some of the trials it was considered as a criminal act, to have been abroad, and *have treated and conversed with Parsons*. The laws themselves, under an idea that his disciples would escape their application if described by the common name of priests, distinguished them by the appellation of *Jesuits*, as in the Act of the 27th Eliz."—*Ib.* 68; *Mem. of Mis. Priests*, i. 348.

English Catholics laboured, through the heavy lapse of two centuries, I should only say what has often been said, and what as often has been said with truth. Devoted to the most extravagant pretensions of the Roman court, he strove to give efficacy to those pretensions in propagating, by many efforts, their validity, and directing their application.¹ Pensioned by the Spanish monarch, whose pecuniary aids he wanted for the success of his various plans, he unremittingly favoured the views of that ambitious prince, in opposition to the welfare of his country, and dared to support, if he did not first suggest, his idle claim or that of his daughter to the English throne.² Wedded to the Society of which he

¹ See *Further Considerations*, 128. "I shall signify to his Holiness," he says, "how necessary it is that he seriously apprehend this business of England, lest at the Queen's death the country fall into worse hands and into greater inconveniences, should an heretical prince, *whoever he may be*, obtain the succession. He shall know that the English Catholics desire a king truly Catholic, be he an Englishman, a Scotchman, or a Spaniard; and that in this business, they consider themselves as principally dependent on his Holiness."—*MS. Letters*. This he wrote to Father Holt in 1597, on his journey from Spain to Rome, six years before the death of Elizabeth.—*Berington*, 26. Parsons flattered himself that this grand result would come to pass by his machinations, and had even written a work for the organisation of the kingdom of England on the glorious event, entitled *A Memorial for the Reformation of England, gathered and set down by R. P.* 1596. "It contains certain notes and advertisements, which might be proposed in the first parliament and national council of our country, after God, of his mercy, shall restore it to the Catholic faith, for the better establishment and preservation of the said religion." These are the author's own words. "He had foreseen this event," says Berington, "as likely to happen at no distant period, and in confidence of his own superior lights, had prepared for it a system of general instruction. His system comprises what may regard the whole body of the people, then the church establishment, and finally the laity, in the king, lords, and commons. But there is little in it that attests any enlargement of mind or just comprehension of the subject. They are the ideas of such a mind as Father Parsons will be understood to have possessed—narrow, arrogant, monastic."—*Ut antea*, 83.

² See *A Conference about the next Succession to the Crown of England, published by R. Doleman*, 1593. "There is sufficient proof," says Berington, "that Parsons was the author of this work, written with a view to establish the Spanish succession against the claim of the Scottish king. It appears to have been

was a member, he sought her glory and pre-eminence ; and, to accomplish this, it was his incessant endeavour to bring under her jurisdiction all our foreign seminaries, and at home to beat down every interest that could impede the aggrandisement of his Order.¹ Thus, having gained an ascendancy over the minds of many, he infused his spirit, and spread his maxims ; and to his successors of the Society, it seems, bequeathed an admiration of his character, and a love of imitation, which

read in manuscript by Cardinal Allen and many others, who highly approved the contents, subscribing to the doctrines, "that, as *the realm of England was a fief of the Holy See*, it principally regarded the pope to settle its succession ; and that it was never lawful for a Catholic, under any pretext, to support a Protestant pretender to the throne." Thus wrote Sir Francis Englefield in 1596, who had been formerly secretary to Queen Mary, but who now resided in Spain, and was the confidential friend of Father Parsons. He gives his judgment on the Book of *Succession*, assigns the motives for the publication, and replies to objections."—*MS. Letters*.

¹ In his "Memorial for a Reformation in England," Parsons having first insisted on the restitution of abbey-lands, as a conscientious obligation, afterwards proceeds to maintain that it would not be "convenient to return them again to the same Orders of religion that had them before." "It may be so," he says, "that many houses and families of that Order of St. Bennet or St. Bernard, or of the monastical profession, though in itself most holy, will neither be possible nor necessary in England, presently upon the first reformation ; but rather, in place of many of them, good colleges, universities, seminaries, schools for increasing our clergy, as also *divers houses of other Orders* that do deal more in preaching and helping of souls. . . . By this manner of restitution, the Church of England would be furnished again quickly of more variety of religious Orders, houses, abbeys, nunneries, hospitals, seminaries, and other like monuments of piety, and to the purpose for present good of our whole realm [more] than ever it was before the desolation thereof . . . there might be planted now, both of these and *other Orders*, according to the condition of those times, lesser houses with smaller rents and numbers of people, *but with more perfection of reformation, edification, and help to the gaining of souls than before* ; and those houses might be most multiplied that should be seen to be most profitable to this effect," pp. 57, 63, 64. Instead of the knights of Malta he would have "some other new Order erected in our country of religious knights," p. 79.—*Tierney*, iv. App. cex. The drift of all this into the gulf of *Our Company*, is amusingly evident. Parsons is said to have been twenty years in compiling this book, which was finished in 1596, but it was not published till some years after his death. Gee published it in 1690.—See *Bayle*, viii. 156.

has helped to perpetuate dissensions, and to make us, to this day, a divided people. His writings, which were numerous, are an exact transcript of his mind—dark, imposing, problematical, seditious. To confirm the foregoing statement, and to prove its truth, I select the following passage from a contemporary author, and an honest man :— ‘ Father Parsons,’ he says, ‘ was the principal author, the incensor, and the mover of all our garboils at home and abroad. During the short space of nearly two years that he spent in England, so much did he irritate, by his actions, the mind of the queen and her ministers, that, on that occasion, the first severe laws were enacted against the ministers of our religion, and those who should harbour them. He, like a dastardly soldier, consulting his own safety, fled. But, being himself out of the reach of danger, he never ceased, by publications against the first magistrates of the republic, or by factious letters, to provoke their resentment. Of these letters many were intercepted, which talked of the invasion of the realm by foreign armies, and which roused the public expectation.¹ Incensed by his work on the Succession, and by similar productions on the affairs of state, under the semblance of a cause that now seemed just, our magistrates rise up in vengeance against us, and execute their laws. They exclaim, that it is not the concern of religion that busies us ; but that, under that cloak, we are meditating politics, and

¹ “ Among those Jesuits, thus suddenly hot and cold,” says Watson, “ one, who calleth himself Darcy, having of long time been together with Gerard, another Jesuit, often tampering underhand, and by messages, with a worshipful knight to have won him to *their* ‘ Bye ’ [Plot], to have stood for the lady Infanta ; promising great and many honourable advancements unto him, if he would, on the Spaniard’s behalf. . . . ”—*Watson to the Lords of the Council*, Aug. 9, 1603, State Paper Office ; apud Tierney, iv. App. i. See *antè*, p. 155, of the present volume.

practising the ruin of the state. Robert Parsons, stationed at his ease, intrepidly, meanwhile, conducts his operations ; and we, whom the press of battle threatens, innocent of any crime, and ignorant of his dangerous machinations, undergo the punishment which his imprudence and audacity alone deserve.' These are the words of John Mush, taken from a work published by him in Latin, and which, in the name of the English clergy, was addressed to Pope Clement VIII."¹

Nor must we forget how true to its beginning was the whole career of this extraordinary man. If the doctors of Oxford sent forth the exasperated serpent, it certainly did not depend upon them, that he did not utterly demolish the Church-establishment. It did not depend upon their efforts or powers of resistance, that his schemes failed in the issue. To the last he bitterly stung his opponents, and "by continual publication of books he did no great good to the Church of England and the noted professors thereof ;"² and it is a curious fact, that the first part of his Book of Succession, namely, that which treats of the "Chastising of Kings and proceedings against them," was reprinted just before the time when King Charles was beheaded ;—the reprint, by Robert Ibbotson, being entitled "Several Speeches made at a Conference, or Several Speeches delivered at a Conference, concerning the power of Parliaments to proceed against their king for misgovernment."³ And by another curious after-stroke, the same

¹ Berington, *ut antea*, 26, 29.

² Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* ii. 68.

³ Wood, ii. 71. Dr. Barlow's note on a spare leaf before the title, says :—"This base and traitorous pamphlet is, verbatim, the first part of Doleman (Parsons was the man under that name) touching succession to the crown. These nine speeches (as here they call them) are the nine chapters in Doleman. And this was printed at the charge of the Parliament, £30 being paid by them

book was reprinted in 1681, “purposely to lay open the author’s pernicious doctrines, in that juncture of time when the Parliament was zealously bent to exclude James, the Catholic Duke of York, from the Imperial Crown of England.”¹ Thus, to friends as well as foes, long after he sank to his rest, was Robert Parsons an affliction—himself “naught advantaged, missing what he aimed.”

Nevertheless, in spite of the wicked deeds of the man—in spite of the still enduring dissensions amongst the Catholic parties of England, so recklessly aggravated, if not begun by Parsons—in spite of the just denunciations which he has received by all who have not been blinded by that “necessity” which will induce men to praise their most unprincipled leaders—Parsons is complimented extravagantly in an epitaph—the last sentence of which is *per omnia virtutis exempla transegit*—“he was a pattern of virtue,”—and Dr. Oliver, a strong, or rather, a weak partisan of the Jesuits, scruples not to apply to Robert Parsons that text of the Bible which says: “The eye of God looked upon him for good, and lifted him up from his low estate, and exalted his head; and many have wondered at him, and have glorified God.”²

to the printer *in perpetuam eorum infamiam*.”—Wood, *ut antea*. The title to the first part of the original is, in its “more particular” form, as follows: “The first part declareth, by many proofs and arguments, that the next propinquity or ancestry of blood alone, though it were certainly known, yet it is not sufficient to be admitted to a crown, without other conditions and circumstances requisite to be found also in the person pretendent.”—Ed. 1681.

¹ Wood, *ut antea*.

² Collections, *Parsons*, p. 162. Parsons was buried in the church of the Roman College, near “his bosom friend” Cardinal Allen, and a very long epitaph was engraved on his tomb, celebrating his exploits, as to the erection of colleges, and his books; stating that he was “always ready, always erect, always rushing through the midst of the flame of the most dangerous conflict—a man utterly reckless of his mighty soul.” In 1687, the floor of the church fell in, and

Certainly if Parsons was the author of the infamous libel called "Leicester's Commonwealth," though many may wonder at him, few have any reason to glorify God thereanent—among the latter, however, Dr. Lingard seems disposed to be classed. Speaking of Leicester, the doctor says: "In 1584, the history of his life, or rather of his crimes, was published in a tract entitled, at first, 'Copy of a Letter,' &c.; but afterwards known by the name of 'Leicester's Commonwealth.' It was generally attributed to the pen of Parsons, the celebrated Jesuit: but whoever might be the author, he had woven his story with so much art, had descended to such minuteness of detail, and had so confidently appealed to the knowledge of living witnesses for the truth of his assertions, that the book extorted the belief and the applause of its readers. Edition after edition was poured into the kingdom, till the queen herself came forward to vindicate the character of her favourite. She pronounced the writer 'an incarnate devil,' declared that of her own knowledge (*it was a bold expression*) she was able to attest the innocence of the earl; and ordered the magistrates to seize and destroy every

Parsons's skull and bones were uncovered. His skull was found to be remarkably larger "than that of others ordinarily be, and there were all his teeth—not one wanting."—*Oliver*, p. 162. In truth, he was a savage biter. Oliver calls Allen the bosom friend of Parsons, as above: but Berington qualifies the "soft impeachment;" he says: "the misfortune was that, naturally easy and unsuspicious, Allen permitted the artful Parsons to gain too great an ascendancy over him, an ascendancy which the crafty politician took care to cement by rendering his *pecuniary services* absolutely necessary to Allen (!). Yet before his death Allen had forfeited the goodwill of the Jesuits. 'Beginning to leave the road in which he had long walked (while devoted to the Society) the thread of his designs and of his life was at once cut.' Thus writes Agazarius, the Italian rector of the Roman College, to Father Parsons, relating similar judgments on others who were alienated from the Society, *MS. Letters*."—*Berington*, 37, *et seq.* The reader remembers a similar judgment-dealing by Parsons, against Cardinal Toledo, for not being hearty enough in the cause of the Jesuit faction of England.

copy which could be discovered.¹ But, if the will of the sovereign could silence the tongues, it did not satisfy the reason, of her subjects. The accomplished Sir Philip Sydney took a different course. He attempted a refutation of the libel. But with all his abilities he sank under the task ; he abused the author, but did not disprove the most important of his statements ; and the failure alone of so able a scholar and contemporary will justify a suspicion, that there was more of truth in the book, than he was willing to admit, and more of crime in the conduct of his uncle than it was in his power to clear away.”² The book was commonly ascribed to Parsons ; and it was said that he received the materials from Lord Burghley. Dr. Thomas James expressly affirmed that Parsons was the author.³ The Jesuit

¹ Dr. Lingard gives a note on this :—“Such interposition,” he says, “in favour of a subject, may appear extraordinary ; but the queen’s letter of thanks to Lord and Lady Shrewsbury, for the attention which they had paid to Leicester at Chatsworth, is still more so. In it she *almost acknowledges* him for her *husband*.” “We should do him great wrong (holding him in that place of favour we do) in case we should not let you understand in how thankful sort we accept the same at both your hands, not as done unto him, but to our own self, reputed him as another ourself.” This is the doctor’s proof for the three words, “almost,” “acknowledges,” and “husband !” So that a queen who, like Elizabeth, should throw such beautiful heartfulness in her complimentary thanks to her subjects, becomes “almost” convicted of marriage on every occasion : so, when Alexander the Great used *the same compliment respecting his friend Ephestion*, he “almost acknowledged him for his husband !” The queen copies King Alexander the Great, and the doctor thereupon represents her like *Pope Alexander VI.* worshipping his mistress under the figure of the Virgin Mary ! When Anne Vaux, writing to Garnet, signed herself “Your’s, and not my own,” does the doctor think “she almost acknowledged him for her husband ?” The incident above alluded to, was when the mother of Darius saluted Ephestion, mistaking him for Alexander. In her confusion at the error, Alexander reassured her, saying, “It matters not, for *he* also is *Alexander*.”—*Val. Maximus*, lib. iv. c. vii. For Anne Vaux’s letter, see *antè*, p. 164, note. Certainly the Queen’s anxiety, on the present occasion, to defend a servant whom she believed innocent, should not be imputed to her as a crime or a sign of guilt.

² Lingard, viii. 288, *et seq.*

³ Jesuits’ Downfall, 55 ; Bayle, viii. 155.

denied it : but he also denied the Book of Succession, and everything else that he did not think proper to own amongst the monsters of his brain. The outside leaves of the libel were green, and hence it was generally called Father Parsons's *Green-coat*.¹

Such was Father Parsons : but the Jesuits are lavish in their praise of him, notwithstanding. They worship the arch-deceiver himself—*viridem colubrum*—and glorify his cheats and disguises—*meritamque vestem*. According to the Jesuit-ed Oliver, “Father Robert Parsons crowned a life of usefulness by a death precious in the sight of God. From his dying bed he dictated letters to his brethren of the Society in England, and to the archpriest, Dr. George Birkhead, breathing *seraphic peace and charity*. In sentiments of melting piety, he surrendered his soul into the hands of God, on the 15th of April, 1610.”² And yet, the truth is, that the letter which Parsons wrote to Birkhead is precisely in the usual style of the specious and calumniating deceiver, and not without the usual samples of “falsehood or equivocation, or both,”—words which Mr. Tierney justly applies to passages in that letter of the sinking Jesuit, to the archpriest, his “very good friend.”³

It may be expedient for “religious” partisans to represent the death of their leaders in the best possible light :—but, in the face of the facts which we have read, to apply Oliver’s praise to Robert Parsons, is to consecrate falsehood, duplicity, equivocation, and the most unscrupulous injustice in calumny—it is to exalt vice, and verily to leave virtue to “its own reward.”

¹ Bayle, *ut antea*.

² Oliver, Collect. 162.

³ See the letter, in Tierney, v. Append. xi., March 20, 1610. Parsons died on the 15th of April.

His age was sixty-four : he had been in the Company six-and-thirty years, during which period he was incessantly machinating against the peace and freedom of his country, and at daggers drawn with the rival missionaries of his own communion, as fiercely as with the abominated heretics, connected with those who had originally “swindged” and “trimmed” him at Oxford—*simplex duntaxat et unum*.

Parsons left his flaming mantle to his brethren : if his “expectation perished with him,” his followers still continued to “work mischief.” Nothing, perhaps, more plainly evinces the opinion entertained of the man than the fact, that the pope thought peace was likely to prevail “now that Father Parsons was dead ;” “but the spirit which he had created,” says Mr. Tierney, “still survived.”¹ His faction still “prosecuted matters as hotly as ever :”—the Jesuits aimed at complete domination, and never would they cease to stir up strife as long as there was an obstacle to be removed, or a boon to be gained. Tedious beyond measure would it be to enlarge on the contention, bitter animosities, disgraceful machinations, which worried the English missionaries. For ten more years, amidst general relaxation of discipline throughout the mission, the clergy continued vigorously to press the appointment of a bishop, but they were as vigorously opposed by the Jesuits, who would have no bishop in their “snug little farm” of England. At length, in 1620, the clergy gained the upper hand at Rome, and the pope was pleased to signify his consent that a bishop, or something like one, should be given to the English Church. Thus foiled in their opposition at Rome, the Jesuits and their partisans resolved, as a last

¹ Tierney, v. 28.

resource, to appeal to the fears of the English monarch. Through the agency of Toby Matthews, perhaps also of Gage, who was strongly attached to the Jesuits, they contrived to frighten James with a false and exaggerated account of the jurisdiction about to be established in his dominions. It was said that a large number of bishops and archbishops was immediately to be appointed ; that they were to bear the titles of the ancient sees of Canterbury, York, London, and other appropriated localities not *in partibus infidelium* ; and that, thus invested with the distinctive appellations, they would soon encroach on the more substantial prerogatives of the national prelacy. The Scotchman shrewdly penetrated the Jesuit-manceuvre, and his chancellor said he was “ afraid that Toby would prove but an apocryphal, and no canonical, intelligencer—acquainting the state with this project for the *Jesuits*’, rather than for *Jesus*’, sake ;”¹ nevertheless, the scheme took effect ; and he denounced the proposed measure as an infringement of his prerogative, solemnly declaring that, under such circumstances, a Catholic bishop should never be admitted into the country. The Spanish ambassador was earnestly requested to interfere : he complied to humour the king, and wrote to Spain’s ambassador at the court of Rome, stating the royal objections to the measure. The Jesuits and their partisans, always on the alert, were ready, on the arrival of this letter, to follow up the machination with a memorial. They covered the deception already practised on the king, with additional misrepresentations, among the rest, that James had solemnly pledged his royal word, in case the measure should be carried into execution, not only to pursue

¹ Cabala, 292 ; Tierney, v. 90.

the bishop himself unto death, but also to revive every former severity, to which the Catholic religion and its professors were obnoxious. Thus they frightened the pope, in his turn, after stirring the conscience of the king's prerogative ; but the pope acted more wisely than the king : he ordered inquiries to be made as to the truth of the representations. Still, so confident was the faction as to the success of their scheme, that the Spanish ambassador in England was requested to nominate a person for the office of archpriest. Meanwhile, however, the clerical party made representations to the chancellor, for the information of the king, as to the real nature of the proposed appointment. The Archdeacon of Cambray, who was attached to the Spanish legation, obtained an interview with the chancellor, pleaded the cause of the clergy, and, to the dismay of the Jesuits and their faction, who had calculated on the hostility of James, an assurance was at length obtained from the minister, stating that the monarch had spoken from misinformation, pointedly alleging the Jesuit-representations before given ; but declaring that, "should a prelate, without pretensions of this kind, and intent only on a discharge of his spiritual duties, be privately commissioned by the pope, no objection would be raised, and no notice would be taken of the appointment." Dr. William Bishop was forthwith appointed "Vicar-Apostolic" of England and Scotland, but nominally "Bishop of Chalcedon, *in partibus infidelium*." ¹

¹ Tierney, v. 90, *et seq.* The Latin words above mean "among the infidels," and constitute the Roman fiction to get rid of the incongruity in appointing a bishop or "vicar-apostolic" (which is something like a bishop) to a See which, in reality, does not exist, according to the law or custom or prerogative of parties in the land. It was an ingenious invention ; and nothing could exceed in elegance the fine sounding titles of the vicars-apostolic, titles which were

This actual reception of one of the biggest limbs of Antichrist, by King James, is apt to startle the reader without explanation. The fact is, that for some time before, James was eagerly striving to marry his son to a daughter of the King of Spain—of course a downright papist and follower of Antichrist. A “dispensation” from the pope was absolutely necessary to join in holy matrimony a Catholic to a heretic. It had first been stipulated that the orthodox opponent of Antichrist should not himself appear in the negotiation : but James was so impatient of delay, by reason of the political advantages in view, that he dispatched George Gage, a Catholic gentleman, to Rome, with letters to the pope and two of the cardinals, whilst his favourite, Buckingham, employed, for the same purpose, Bennet, the very same priest who was negotiating for a bishop, as agent of the seculars.

selected from the classic map of the *Orbis Veteribus Cognitus*, or the World as Known to the Ancients. Chalcedon, Trachis, Melipotamus, and other invisible “towered cities” of the olden time, might entitle their episcopal bearer to the very laborious honour of governing a district in the Anglo-Catholic Church—cheap titles well befitting men whose “honours” brought them no pay whatever beyond the usual pittance of the mission. In my youth, I heard of such a poor, but most worthy and laborious bishop, who frequently carried home in his pocket a pennyworth of *potatoes* whereon to make his meal. And he did not think that any better lot than he enjoyed was necessary to “maintain the dignity of religion”—though, assuredly, much might have been superadded to the “revenues” of that worthy bishop, without in the least *diminishing* “the dignity of religion.” Since then, things have somewhat changed. Our Catholic “vicars-apostolic” now call themselves *bishops* of this and that “district” of England, and there is, or was very lately, much talk of a Catholic “archbishop”—all signs of certain decay—yea, the very prophecy of doom. In connection with the old foreign titles, I may state that, once upon a time, there applied to the pope a certain inhabitant of some village in Greece, or Asia Minor, craving a “dispensation.” The “rule” required that he should apply to “his bishop.” Now he had no bishop to apply to, until it was found that an English Catholic bishop was *en-titled* to his village—in *partibus infidelium*: so the pope sent him to England, and the modern Telemachus found his Ulysses somewhere in the “Northern District”—the worthy Dr. Penswick, I believe. This is a “tradition.”

This was, indeed, a fortunate coincidence ; and it was made the most of, as may be imagined—and very properly too :—the pope insisted on the mitigation of the penal laws by way of compensation for his dispensation—and never was a dispensation more charitably bartered. James at once complied—pardons for recusancy were granted for a term of five years—and the remorseless prisons gave up their dead, to attest that the most vigorous orthodoxy sometimes expires—crucified by expediency, the most unscrupulous Jew that ever existed. Disgusting as was the cause, still the result was delightful. It was a breathing time for all. The agreement of the marriage between the heretic son of England, and the Catholic daughter of Spain, was actually arranged in the same month of the same year that a “ vicar-apostolic ” was first wedded to the forlorn lady of the Catholic Church of England. It was on that very memorable occasion that the Prince of Wales and the Duke of Buckingham—assuming the names of John Smith, and Thomas Smith—went on a pilgrimage—like the obedient son of Isaac from Canaan—in quest of a wife in the Padan-aram of Spain—as though his canonical father had said to him : “ Take thee a wife thence of the daughters of Laban, thy grandmother’s brother of *the faith*.” It proved a failure, as all the world knows—but with that same pilgrimage, as far as the future Charles I. was concerned, began that chain of events which ended with giving a martyr to the “ Protestant ” calendar and Church-service of England. In truth, the Puritans were, and had been, long wide awake, and they shook their heads when they heard of this transaction—and well they might, according to the flinty principles they grasped and inculcated—when they heard that

the young prince and Buckingham had induced King James to write another letter to the pope, styling Anti-christ, "Most holy Father"—and when they were told "that the pope, being informed of the duke's inclination and intention, in point of religion, sent unto him a particular bull in parchment, for to persuade and encourage him in the perversion of the prince."¹ These rumours were prospective, the "shadow of coming events :"—but their immediate result was soon apparent. No sooner was the expedient match broken off, when a petition knocked at the door of the king's conscience, denouncing the Catholic clergy as the "professed engines of Spain," the laity as a body of traitors, and praying for instant execution of the laws against the miserable scapegoats, ever fooled or torn by the wolves of faction, Catholic and Protestant. Formerly the king had said : "As for a toleration of the Roman religion, as God shall judge him, he never thought nor meant, nor never in word expressed anything that savoured of it"—but still was toleration agreed upon for the sake of the expedient marriage. And now, in the present squall, he said that "the increase of popery was as thorns in his eyes and pricks in his sides"—and promised strictly to enforce the infamous laws, in deference to the clamours of party :—the latter expediency was more imperative than the former, but it was not in the least more respectable. And the second state of the Catholics was decidedly worse than the first, precisely because a bitter disappointment, sanguine hopes frustrated, gave an additional pang to the stern realities of grinding oppression. What a lesson ! And there let us leave it.²

¹ Coke, i. 152.

² Tierney, v. 152 ; Coke, i. 162 ; Rushworth, f. 101 ; Lingard, ix. 219.

The sons of the Catholics, sent abroad “for their education,” fared little better than their parents at home. These youths were sent abroad in spite of the laws which inflicted such severe penalties for the transgression. They paid a stipend for the support of their children, varying from 30*l.* to 100*l.* yearly. When these youths departed they changed their names, and ever after adopted an *alias* whenever expedient :—at first to evade the law, and afterwards to mystify their proceedings and correspondence in those times of peril.—The Jesuits, as we have seen in the trial of Garnet, followed the example of Parsons and Campion—and taxed their invention to the utmost in the application. “What’s in a name?” was a very important question in those days—particularly as conscience might be taxed to select one which would require the fewest falsehoods to keep up the deception.

The English Seminary at Rome had been, as we have seen, transferred to the Jesuits. Jealousy and dissatisfaction were the result among the seculars, who naturally considered the transaction as a reflection on the clerical body—an undue elevation of a rival Order at their expense,—as a step which would ultimately tend to convert both the institution and its funds into a fruitful source of aggrandisement to the Company. Without recapitulating what has already been narrated, suffice it to say, that the usual irregularities crept *in*, expanded unchecked, and were suffered to creep *out*, when the burly Parsons went to his last account, leaving no one equal to himself in the whelming art of browbeating, whereby the cry for reform is sometimes “put down.” The Jesuit Owen succeeded Parsons in the rectorship of the house. He was a man of considerable experience,

but of strong predilections, of lofty notions, and, of course, of an ardent attachment to the various interests of his Order.¹ To these qualifications we must add, the spirit of speculation, traffic, and that misappropriation of the funds which Mariana long before lashed so severely. He made the English Seminary a tavern for his Company, where the members might always make themselves comfortable, for months together. A procurator of their missions had free quarters in the establishment, or, at all events, it did not appear that he “paid his fare :” he kept his horse in the college-stable, had his cellars in the college-vineyard, to store his vintage. Father Owen paid his husbandmen out of the college-fund, and very often treated them to dinners and suppers.² “In 1611, Owen purchased and stocked a large farm on Monte Porzio, near Rome, from which he was enabled to supply the markets of the city with cattle, corn, wine, and fruit, to a considerable extent. The whole property was vested in the fathers of the English mission, of which Owen was the prefect : but, to avoid the duties payable to government, this was partially concealed ; the stock, when brought to market, was represented to belong to the seminary ; and the horses and servants, employed in its conveyance and sale, were lodged in the college, and entertained at its sole expense.”³ This abuse was attended with vast expenses—to the English Seminary ; and the result was embarrassment, insolvency. Legacies had been obtained : the number of scholars had been diminished by more than one-third—

¹ Tierney, v. 94. *et seq.*

² “Summarium de corruptâ Collegii Anglicani administratione.”—*MS. apud Tierney*, v. 96.

³ Tierney, *ut antea*. He gives a valuation of the expenses, from an original document.

yet in the course of a few years, it was found that a debt of no less than nine thousand crowns of gold was pressing upon the resources of the house.¹

The Jesuits did not stop there : there was a necessity upon them, which they could not shake off—though ruin manifestly impended. “Intent on the advancement of their own body, it became the constant endeavour of the superiors to secure it amongst the scholars entrusted to their care. With this view, the more promising members of the establishment were invariably selected as the objects of their attention. Every art of favour and flattery was employed to win the affections of these parties ; and every means of obloquy was adopted to depress the clergy, and to exalt the Jesuits, in their estimation. Prayers and spiritual exercises were then brought into action : doubts and scruples on the subject of vocation were suggested ; and an invitation was at length given to them to abandon the present object of their pursuit, and to inscribe their names in the lists of the Society.² If they withstood these solicitations, neglect and persecution followed them through the remainder of their course :—if they yielded to the wishes, and engaged to join the ranks, of the fathers, distinctions and privileges were sure to mark their career :—impunity for almost every transgression

¹ Tierney, *ut antea*, with documental vouchers.

² “Hac ratione anno transacto, et novitiorum animis, per commensationes et blanditias, per scrupulos et animi anxietates, per societatis laudes aliorumque religiosorum et sæcularium sacerdotum vituperia, ad vocationem capessendam dispositis, integrâ septimanâ in spiritualibus exercitiis detinentur, quæ cum optima et piissima sint, eâ tamen ratione dantur, ut ad Societatis ingressum plurimos inducant . . . nam electio novi status vitæ proponitur ; imò, *ad eam hanc novam deliberationem urgent, ut meditationes quasdam et orationes propositas nemo sincerè peragere possit, nisi religiosum statum amplexurus.*”—*Narratio de Corruptelâ Collegii Anglicani*, &c., 1623, c. i. p. 6. Orig. MS. formerly belonging to the college, and now in the possession of Mr. Tierney.

was ensured to them, and facilities in the prosecution of their studies were accorded, from which their less compliant brethren were carefully debarred. The lay-brothers of the Company employed about the house, were permitted to insult them: they were the butt of general contempt—oppressed, abused, shunned, excluded on all occasions.¹ Even in their studies they were thwarted—almost always excluded from the public disputations. Expulsion may be supposed to have been an easy process in such a government—judging from the fact that a student of Douay was expelled by the Jesuits merely for exhorting his associates to become secular priests, rather than Jesuits, contrary to the destination of the seminary.² It will easily be imagined that, under such circumstances, few would be found to resist the temptations by which they were surrounded. Of forty-seven persons who left the college, during the seven years immediately preceding 1623, fourteen only, of the *most incompetent*, were added to the body of the clergy: the remaining thirty-three, after obtaining the whole, or the greater part, of their education at the expense of the establishment, passed at once to the novitiate of the fathers.”³

¹ “Patrum Societatis coadjutores, qui famulorum officia obeunt, permittuntur clericis insultare . . . Illud quod maximè clericos deiecit, est dedecus summum quo in collegio hoc afficiuntur clerici: illos enim, levissimis de causis, non solum verbis et factis deprimunt, uti jam dictum est, sed ita etiam contemptos reddunt, ut ab ipsorum consortio omnes in collegio abhorreant,” &c.—*Ut suprà*, 46, 53, 95, 24, 25, 32, 33.

² Extract from the Douay Diary, 15th Dec., 1622.—*Apud Tierney*. The matter was actually brought under the notice of the Inquisition, and the Jesuits were compelled to give the student a testimonial of good morals in *other respects*. See Tierney, v. 98, note.

³ From a memorial, presented by the agent Rant, to the protector of the mission, in 1625,—Rant’s own copy in Mr. Tierney’s possession. “I have,” says Mr. Tierney, “five other lists, all agreeing, in almost every particular, with this; and all giving the most melancholy account of the qualifications, corporeal

Was it, therefore, to be wondered at, that long before, in 1619, the clergy had memorialised Pope Paul V. on the subject, boldly and plainly denouncing the practices of the Jesuits, their cruel spoliation of that Naboth's vineyard—the support of the English mission. “On the other hand,” they said to the pope, “we have found by long experience, that the Jesuits rather had regard to domestic convenience, and were far from being serviceable to the clergy in that office ; which plainly appeared from their continual practising upon the students, to withdraw them from the institution, wherein they *were engaged by oaths*, and bring them over, either to the Society, or to some other religious order. This kind of practices being detected by St. Charles Borromeus (of pious memory), among the Jesuits, to whose care he had committed his seminary at Milan, he removed them, and gave the whole government up to the clergy. But, we, alas ! not a little unfortunate on this account, have been obliged, now several years, to submit to all the inconveniences of that economy, not only in the seminaries of Rome and Spain (which, though instituted for the benefit and propagation of the clergy, are now become, as it were, only *noviceships for the Society*), but even in that seminary, which was founded and carried on by the labours and blood of the clergy.”¹

and mental, of most of the fourteen who became members of the clerical body [priests of the English mission]. Three were incapacitated for labour by want of health ; one was epileptic ; one had been rejected by the fathers, on account of an impediment in his speech ; three others, besides one of the preceding, were utterly disqualified for learning ; and two, whose abilities were of a better order, were not intended for the English mission, but were beneficed in France and Belgium. Thus there remained but four in seven years, whose services were really available for the purposes of their original destination.” Of course the whole extract in the text is from Tierney, v. 97, *et seq.* I have added to his text from his notes in the original, which I have also quoted.

¹ See the whole Memorial in Tierney, v. Append. xxxv. All these proceedings,

The English students reluctantly submitted to the systematic oppression of the Roman Seminary. When Bennet, the agent of the clergy, went to Rome, the scholars who were suffering from the partiality or the resentment of the Jesuits, waited upon him, stated their complaints, explained the condition of the college, and resolved to seek redress by an appeal to the pope. The pope entertained their petition, and decreed a visitation of the college. A prelate was appointed and authorised to inquire into the state of its administration.¹

It was not likely that the gathering storm should burst on the Jesuits unprepared, or without an effort on their part to avert destruction. A consultation ensued at the Tusculan villa, where the general resided, and the first resolution was to induce the protector of the mission, Cardinal Farnese, to prevent the approaching investigation. "When this failed, another scheme was adopted. A paper, extolling the government of the fathers, and asserting the groundlessness of all complaints, was prepared and presented to each student for his signature. As might have been expected, the

perhaps, afford a striking illustration of the adage :—

" Great fleas have little fleas,
And less fleas to bite 'em,
And those fleas have less fleas,
And so *ad infinitum*."

Or perhaps better thus : " Wisdom for a man's self, is in many branches thereof a depraved thing : it is the wisdom of rats that will be sure to leave a house some time before it fall : it is the wisdom of the fox, that thrusts out the badger who digged and made room for him : it is the wisdom of crocodiles, that shed tears, when they would devour. But that which is specially to be noted is, that those which (as Cicero says of Pompey) are "*sui amantes sine rivali*," admit no rival in their selfish schemes, are many times unfortunate ; and *whereas they have all their time sacrificed to themselves, they become in the end themselves sacrifices to the inconstancy of fortune, whose wings they thought by their self-wisdom to have pinioned.*" Thus wrote Bacon ; it applies exactly to the Jesuits ; the sequel will soon rapidly evolve the decrees of retribution. ¹ Tierney, v. 100, and note.

majority, some from fear, others from affection, at once subscribed the document, and were thus effectually precluded from exposing the abuses of the house. Fifteen of the students, however, out of a total of forty-five, had the courage to refuse their names. These were immediately separated from their companions; a mark of degradation was placed on them; and a resolution was forthwith adopted to destroy their evidence against the superiors, by charging them with sedition. Threats, flattery, or abuse, extorted many of the signatures to the counter-petition: but the most interesting part of the affair was that the Jesuits committed themselves by overdoing the deed of self-approbation. In its original state, the paper made the subscribers express their approbation of the government of the fathers, for *twenty years*, and in each of the two colleges of Rome and St. Omer. Subsequently, it was recollected that, of the students, few had been at St. Omer's at all, and scarcely any could speak of Rome for so long a period:—the passage was, therefore, expunged. The visitation began, proceeded slowly, and was cut short by the sudden and unexpected death of the pope, Gregory XV. In his successor, Urban VIII., the Jesuits had one of their earliest friends and patrons.¹ When the order for the visitation was renewed, an important alteration was effected. At the request of the Jesuits, the former visitor was superseded, and his place was supplied by an ardent friend to the Company—appointed at the nomination of the superiors themselves; and the investigation proceeded exactly as may be supposed when party-reporters undertake a “job,” with eyes and ears expressly contrived for the occasion. This visitor was

¹ Ranke, 137.

required by his duty to stand between the parties :— he at once sided with the Jesuits—and boldly showed the spirit within him. He should have tried to establish peace on the foundation of justice ;—he at once defended the Jesuits and rebuked their accusers. He would listen to no justification whatever—nay, on the most important point—the mission, he said “ If the fathers had enticed the students to the Company, they were *warranted in the proceeding* : if they had sent only the refuse of the seminary to join the clergy on the mission, the clergy should *pray that God* would raise up worthier members to the secular body. The abuse which the superiors had constantly lavished on Bennet, Kellison, and others, was deserved :—the revolting slanders, by which they had sought to poison the minds of the students against the clerical body, were a *legitimate* means of reminding them of their own frailty, and cautioning them against criminal excesses.¹ Even the partialities of the fathers were not without their merit—they afforded the scholars an *opportunity of virtue*, and were *intended as a preparation* for that missionary career, in which patience would so often be required.”² This last contrivance was certainly a kind provision in the Jesuits, in order to enable the poor wretches of the clergy to meet the “ providential ” calamities, “ the vials of Wrath ” which the Company poured on the mission. The winding up of the visitation was atrocious. Charge upon charge he heaped on the recusant students. “ Of their turbulent and seditious behaviour, he declared, there could be no doubt. They had complained of the superiors—they

¹ Mr. Tierney quotes the original, and says :—“ I purposely omit the slanders from motives of decency.”—v. 104.

² *Narratio Causæ, ut supra* ; Tierney, v. 104.

had condemned the government of the house—they had formed a conspiracy with Bennet, the inveterate enemy of the Company, to eject the fathers from the establishment; and, however he might otherwise be inclined to spare their character and their feelings, in the present instance he was determined to sacrifice every milder consideration, and to deprive them for ever of the means of disturbing the seminary. It was in vain that they asserted their innocence, and denied the imputation thus cast on their intercourse with Bennet. In the evening, their sentence was publicly read in the refectory. Five were condemned to be expelled: two, though their course was unfinished, were ordered *to join the mission in England*; and the rest were united in one body, and subjected indiscriminately to a course of penance in the college. On the following morning, the five, one of them only just recovering from a fever, and all without either money, or clothes adapted to the approaching season, took their departure from the seminary.”¹ And lest they should find an asylum in Douay, the protector wrote to Kellison informing him of what had occurred, and cautioning him not to admit them into that seminary.²

This is not the expulsion of the Jesuits from every kingdom of the world, and finally, their suppression by the pope himself:—it is only one specimen of their own conduct towards their own people; and ere you read of that terrible thunderbolt of crushing retribution which shattered the Company of the Jesuits, you will have been prepared to adore that Providence which must punish, as well as reward,—here below, as well as hereafter.

Appeals to Rome from England ensued: by the pope

¹ Tierney, v. 104.

² Ibid. v. 105.

a new investigation was appointed, and, in spite of the opposition of the Jesuits, the Propaganda, to which tribunal the pope had referred the matter, decreed that the students were to be honourably removed to Douay, and concluded with a serious admonition to the Jesuit-rector, as to his conduct towards the students, particularly in the matter of expulsion. For the future no student, educated on the foundation, was to enter any religious order or company, without special license from the pope : each scholar, on his admission, was to take an oath to that effect, and to be ready, at the command of the protector or the Propaganda, to take orders and return to England on the mission.¹ These mandates corrected, or were adapted to correct, many of the existing abuses ; but what did the Jesuits ever care for mandates ? The crying abuses, peculation, spoliation, and traffic at the expense of the college, were covered with a prohibitory mandate, and the Jesuits went on as usual—though of course the animosities of the English evangelists were considerably expanded by this affair, in order to promote their trials on the mission.

Meanwhile the Company was possessed of immense leverage in the various courts of Europe. They had been compelled to leave Venice in 1606. Paul V. had excommunicated that republic for refusing to give up two priests accused of horrible misdemeanours, and delivered over to the secular arm. This was said to violate the “ecclesiastical immunities,” and the pope came down with his excommunication. The Venetian Senate forbade the instrument to be published in their dominions—declaring the sentence unjust and illegal—enjoining all ecclesiastics to disregard the papal anathema, and

¹ Tierney, *ubi suprâ*.

continue their spiritual functions notwithstanding. The Jesuits upheld the papal mandate, which was affixed to five churches during the night, and they preached up obedience to the censures. The doge summoned them before him : the Jesuits persisted in their determination to comply rigidly with the papal injunction. The consequence was, their expulsion from Venice ; and the fathers took their departure, amidst the execrations of the multitude assembled, according to Fra Paolo ; but with the lamentation of some of their friends, according to the annual letter on the occasion.¹ To have placed obedience to the pope in one balance, and twelve or fifteen thousand crowns, their Venetian rental, in the other, and to have made the former preponderate, seems to be very disinterested conduct in the Jesuits : but whilst their opponents at Venice, with Paolo at their head, congratulated themselves on thus “fixing” the Jesuits by compelling them to be consistent, the Jesuits, on the other hand, knew what they were about, and easily threw up a comparatively small rental, for the sake of hampering and embarrassing the party whom they suspected of machinations for the introduction of Lutheranism into the republic,—which would prove much more disastrous to the rent-roll.

The resolute example of the Jesuits was followed by the Theatines, the Capuchins, and other monks of the republic : the patriarch of Venice retired to Padua ; and other influential ecclesiastics openly proclaimed the rights and prerogatives of the popedom. Such was the force of this calculated example—and, we may add, not without the usual machinations with which, as we have

¹ Storia Particolare, lib. ii. 67 ; Litt. Ann. Soc. Jesu, 1606 ; Cretineau, iii. 135.

seen, the exasperated Jesuits “worked mischief.” Considering the admitted suspicion of the Jesuits with regard to the underhand introduction of Protestantism,¹ there was certainly reason to believe that the Jesuits had stirred Paul V. against the senate, just as they hardened him into his cruel conduct towards the Catholics of England in the affair of the oath of allegiance. The result, however, as usual, did the Jesuits no good, though it produced bitterness to all else concerned. The alleged practices of the Jesuits on the wives and children of Venice, to stir up resistance to the reigning will of the state, and all their other machinations as recorded, may have been the exaggerations of less objectionable measures : but, in the given circumstances, there is surely no reason to suppose that the Jesuits remained idle when all their policy demanded that they should be stirring.² Many reasons were subsequently given by the authorities of Venice for the banishment of the Jesuits : the most cogent of which was, doubtless, the great influence they had acquired with the young aspirants to office in the republic, who, confiding in the promised patronage of the Jesuits, were taught to feel independent of the chief magistrates—in other words, that the Jesuits were establishing an “empire in the empire,” were building up a political domination in Venice, buttressed with their numberless spiritual contrivances.³

¹ Cretineau, iii. 134.

² Thuan. l. 137, Ann. 1607.

³ Thuanæ, *Jesuites*. “I remember,” says Bayle, “that asking a person who told me numberless profligate actions of the Venetian clergy, what could prompt the senate to wink at them, when they reflected so much dishonour both on religion and government? He answered, that it was necessary those things should be connived at for the public good ; and to explain the enigma, he added, that the senate were never better pleased than when the common people held the priests and friars in the utmost contempt, since those were then less able to spirit them up to rebellion. *One of the reasons, says he, why the government of*

Be that as it may,—but certainly the state was justified in expelling a set of men who were openly resolved to set the law of the land at defiance, and to sow division among the people, with fanatical exhortations. No entreaties could shake the resolution of the senate. Henry IV. of France, mediated and petitioned in favour of the Jesuits, or rather, to bring about a reconciliation between the pope and the republic :—but the objections against the Jesuits were too strong to be overruled, and they were banished in perpetuity—which, however, was only for the term of fifty years, when the Company contrived to achieve a glorious return to the City of the Doge.¹ In fact, the hatred prevalent in Venice against the Jesuits was intense, as may appear from the words of the leader of their opponents. “You will excuse me,” says Fra Paolo, “if I make no difference between a Spaniard and a Jesuit, except this (wherein I agree with you),

*Venice does not like the Jesuits is, because those fathers observe a better decorum ; and as the vulgar venerate them, because of their more regulated exterior, they therefore have a greater opportunity of raising seditions. I can hardly believe so horrid a circumstance to be true. At what a wretched pass would things be, was the supreme authority forced to support itself by such expedients ; or did a virtuous behaviour render the clergy more formidable than dissoluteness,” &c.—Dict. v. 163. Of course, nothing can be more absurd than this piece of political gossip, and with the philosopher, we “can hardly believe so horrid a circumstance to be true ;” but I quote the passage, merely to point out one of the “rogueries” of “Father Prout,” in his “Reliques.” This amusing writer tells us (p. 298, note of vol. i.) alluding to this expulsion of the Jesuits, that “in Bayle’s Dictionary will be found the real cause of their expulsion ; they may be proud of it.” An uninformed reader would naturally suppose that Bayle puts forth some historical fact whereof the Jesuits might be “proud,” whereas it turns out to be a paltry piece of gossip, which he expressly questions with a generous moral sentiment, that “Prout,” with all his theology, could not conceive. Moreover, it must be remembered that the prime cause of the difference with the pope was the punishment of *immoral priests*. That the Venetian priests were bad enough, is doubtless true ; but that the Jesuits were expelled because they were better, is, I think, as absurd as it is false in point of fact. See Bayle, however, for the rest of the note : ’tis a curious chapter in Romanism, &c. Abelard, (P).*

¹ Cretineau, iii. 132, 150.

that I hold the greatest Spanish rogue in the world to be a better man than the least wicked Jesuit that exists—for a Spaniard hath bowels in his brains, and hath a capacity of learning some good, if he be taught it; but the Jesuits are all flint, and their consciences are darkened, and there is no speaking to them, unless you have a kingdom to embroil, or a parliament to toss up into the air.”¹

At the court of Austria the influence of the Jesuits was paramount. Rodolph II. was reigning. Educated at the court of Spain, under the auspices of Philip, and by the Jesuits, he was, during his whole reign, rendered totally subservient to the court of Madrid. His learning, which, in a person of a different character, might have counteracted the predominant influence, only contributed to rivet the fetters of early habit and education. What is most remarkable is, that he was greatly addicted to alchemy, or its pursuit, and still more to judicial astrology.² The toleration which he found established by his father was soon superseded by the most rigorous measures against the Protestants—the formulary of the Catholic faith had to be signed as peremptorily as the oath of allegiance to King James; no man was admitted to the rights of citizenship without taking an oath of submission to the Catholic priesthood: finally, he shut up many Protestant churches. Thus, whilst the Jesuits were complaining in England against persecution, they were instigating the measure in Austria; and, what is more, enjoying the triumph which accrued on the “restoration of Catholicism,” as it was called by the bigots. The intestinal dissensions amongst the Protestants themselves admirably promoted the systematic

¹ Letters to Father Paul, translated by Brown, ed. 1693, p. 96.

² Coxé, Austria, ii. 63, *et seq.*

assault of their opponents. The Jesuits took advantage of these dissensions, and, with consummate ingenuity, turned the arguments and precedents advanced by the Protestants against themselves. They urged that the "religious peace" was now abrogated, for it was not applicable to the Calvinists, because the Lutherans themselves had disclaimed them as brethren,—nor to the Lutherans, because, by adopting a new creed, they no longer adhered to the confession of Augsburg, which was the basis of the "religious peace." With the same address, they brought forward the mutual persecutions of the Protestants as an argument that Catholic sovereigns had as much right to deprive their Protestant subjects of religious toleration, as the Protestant princes had assumed by forcibly establishing, in their dominions, their own peculiar tenets. In conformity with the suggestions of the Jesuits, therefore, the Catholic body adopted a systematic plan for the gradual extirpation of the Protestant tenets, which they set in operation under the name of "reform." The grand principle of the system was, to force the Protestants to *insurrection*, by rigidly executing the letter of the "religious peace," and other compacts, between Catholics and Protestants, by interpreting in their own favour every stipulation which was left doubtful, and by revoking every tacit concession which had been yielded from fear rather than conviction; and thus to make every new restriction appear not an act of persecution, but a just chastisement of disobedience and insurrection. This project, with other provisions, was carried into execution with uniform consistency and perseverance by the ministers who directed the counsels of the emperor, and was supported by all the weight of the Spanish court under Philip III., who was enabled to detach for its

execution, a part of the great military force which he maintained in the Netherlands.¹

It is impossible to describe the endless division and discord which resulted from this scheme, and the machinations with which it was developed. Rodolph abolished the Protestant worship in Austria, and then operated on Bohemia: everywhere the Protestants were driven to insurrection. Henry IV. of France came to their rescue. Besides political interests, which urged him to humble the house of Austria, Henry had long entertained a personal antipathy to the Spanish branch of that dynasty, whose interference in the affairs of the League prolonged that calamity, as we have seen, and made every effort to prevent his accession to the throne. And now the converted Huguenot, in spite of his Jesuits, comes forward to aid the Protestants of Germany in their battle against the tyranny and nefarious schemes of the emperor and Jesuits of Austria. The Catholics were arming; the Protestants had already commenced aggressions; the United Provinces were preparing to come forward; the march of the French troops, who were ready to move at a moment's warning, would have been the signal for a general war, which would have desolated Germany from one extremity to the other, and perhaps ruined the house of Austria, and with it the Catholic cause of the pope-dom and the Jesuits. Henry IV. was the grand paramount of this portentous design; and there was no one to front the redoubtable warrior. They trembled in Austria: but in Spain they were inexplicably apathetic at the prospect—for *Ravaillac* murdered Henry IV. at the very moment when he was preparing to head his army!

A. D. 1610.

¹ Coxe, Austria, ii. 66, 70.

Fail not, in the first place, to consider that this universal ruin of the house of Austria, as threatened with such probability of success by this new war of Europe, was brought about by the plan of the Jesuits for abolishing Protestantism and establishing Romanism. That murder of Henry IV. by Ravaillac was a catastrophe to the Protestant cause : whilst the Catholics, as much encouraged as the Protestants were cast down by the blow, assembled their forces with redoubled zeal and resolution. And now let us turn to the scene of the murder.

It is now generally admitted that the stupendous scheme of establishing a "*Christian Republic*," entered into the brain of Henry IV. He had resolved to divide it into fifteen dominations or states, all as equal as possible in power and resources, with limits specified by the fifteen in council assembled or represented. The popedom was first named in the list, France came in the third place, England in the fifth, and so forth, down to Switzerland. There was to be royalty by succession in five, six electorates, four republics—two of which were to be democratic—the other two aristocratic. A council of sixty heads, deputed from all the dominations collectively, were to settle all the differences of the confederates—and to be called the Senate of the *Christian Republic*,—which senate was to establish such regulations amongst the sovereigns and their subjects, as would hinder, on one hand, the oppression and tyranny of princes, and on the other, stop the complaints and rebellion of their subjects.

To point out the numberless obstacles that would everlastingly render abortive, nay calamitous, such a scheme of domination, would be here out of place and useless anywhere :—but the most absurd and incongruous

part of the plan was, that it was to be brought about by—*War*. After battering all who opposed the scheme, these opponents were to be expected to settle down quietly with an “O be joyful,” in the Christian Republic! *Austria*, above all, was most to suffer from this gigantic creation. She was to be pulled to pieces in order to patch up the “little ones.” She was to be forcibly “trimmed.” Vast was the armament required for the conquest of this desirable Canaan. Henry IV. multiplied his levies of men and filled his treasury with gold—gave his whole soul to the chimæra—as the most Christian king, who was so well adapted to create a *Christian Republic*? But, behold, in the very seed-time of the glorious project, an incident occurred, as if on purpose to show what work the future Senate of the Christian republic would be likely to have in hand, when dealing with the *Dominations*. Henry was in love (if the phrase be applicable) with the young wife of the Prince de Condé. The prince suddenly left the French Court, and took refuge in the Netherlands:—“it was said that Henry had insulted the princess with that adulterous lust which respected nothing—neither the fidelity of race, nor the ties of family, nor political interests.” This may, however, have been only the pretext: it is very probable that the Spanish agents contrived the flight by way of a “distraction.” Their machinations, subsequently, not only with the prince, but with Henry’s cast-away mistress, Henriette, and others in France, were notorious. Spain had spies even in the royal council. The Spaniards had never ceased to pursue their old enemy. Henry IV. had failed to secure himself, as he fancied, by making friends with the Jesuits. If those in France were faithful to him, those

in Spain and in Austria might make their French brethren the cloak of their iniquitous machinations. The horrible remnants of the League still lingered round about that anomalous king—the spies of Spain looked eagerly for chances. Henry hated the Spaniard most bitterly—and now that his enemy had sheltered the husband of the woman he craved—and would not give them up—his resolve to set about the Christian Republic was roused to redoubled activity and frothy boasting. In an angry interview, when Spain's ambassador demanded the object of the mighty armaments, Henry evaded the question and boastfully exclaimed: "If the king your master forces me to mount my horse, I'll go and hear mass at Milan, breakfast at Rome, and dine at Naples." "Sire," replied the ambassador, "going at that rate, perhaps your Majesty might go to vespers in Sicily."¹ But the "Sicilian vespers" were "dispensed" with.

Henry IV. was murdered in his carriage. There were six attendants within. And yet, it was said, no one saw the blow given:—they must have shut their eyes, assuredly. The unfortunate king died nobly: he expired without a groan. The people, in their sudden fury, insulted the hotel of the Spanish Ambassador: but the queen sent him a guard, and thereby gave the Spaniard "a high notion of that princess." Spain and Austria were incalculably "benefited," as they thought, by the catastrophe: they were certainly freed from a very dangerous enemy. And who will believe that Ravallac was not a suborned assassin? The occasion was so well managed that, had the murderer been able to throw away his knife, he would have been unknown—"but he could not let go his hold."

¹ Capefigue, 497.

But fixed to the spot, there he stood, till they took him, examined, condemned, and executed him with the most excruciating circumstance of torture—in which he evinced the usual fortitude of a “martyr.”

What the assassin said at his examinations, was neither published in full, nor investigated—and every precaution was taken to suppress the evidence.

Public suspicion fell on the king’s discarded mistress, on the Duke d’Epernon, on the queen herself, and on the Jesuits. The enemies of the Jesuits allege as the cause, that Henry had lately inflicted a reprimand on the fathers, for having been overhasty in erecting a novitiate in Paris !¹ Certainly no explanation can be more ridiculous : it is as though they would raise a volcano to boil an egg.

Besides the political scheme in hand, many were the sources of danger which Henry IV. had dug for himself. The jealousies and resentments of his mistresses the Marchioness de Verneuil and her family, the Countess de Moret, Essarts, and the Princess de Condé, involved him in frequent quarrels with his queen.

The queen was a *zealous* Catholic, and entertained the surmises concerning the king’s political schemes against the *church*—though his scheme gave a domination to the popedom. The report was general over Paris, that the proposed war was to overthrow the popedom, and to establish the Protestant faith. The pope’s nuncio pretended to believe it. With this plan the queen associated the proposal of her own repudiation, to make way for the king’s marriage with the Princess de Condé, to whom, though now married, Henry seemed attached almost to distraction.²

¹ Hist. abrégée des Jesuites, i. 302.

² Ranken, vii. 107.

The veil which overhangs the mystery of this murder, will never, perhaps, be torn asunder. Many were interested in the catastrophe :—Spain especially, and the whole house of Austria. It was a dismal epoch of secret murders—stabs in the dark—in narrow streets—even on the gloomy threshold of palaces—how numerous were the assassins whom Spain had hired in her projects against England, in her vengeance against Holland! Ravallac may have been the doomed martyr for Spain. It is certain in Germany, the news of the murder spread so rapidly that it was said to have been predicted, with the day and hour.¹

Unquestionably the murder of Henry IV. cannot be laid to the charge of the Jesuits exclusively,—if at all, in the absence of all proof against them. Considering, however, their position in Spain and Austria, and the well-known opinions of their regicidal casuists, as applied to the peculiarities of the present case, the following incidents are somewhat striking—though of course, inconclusive, even if authentic—for the Jesuits deny everything.

When the news of the king's assassination reached the Louvre, Father Cotton, as if conscious of a coming accusation, instinctively aimed at diverting suspicion from his party ; and exclaimed, “ Ah ! who has killed this good prince ; this pious, this great king ? Is it not a *Huguenot* ? ” Afterwards, when he visited Ravallac in prison, he cautioned him against incriminating *les gens de bien*—“ honest folks.”²

Father D'Aubigny, another Jesuit, who had been consulted by Ravallac, was particularly questioned by the chief president, respecting the secret of confession :

¹ Capefigue, 507.

² Journal de Henri IV. Fev. 1611 ; Browning, 207.

—but the wary Jesuit answered only by sophisms : he said : “ That God, who had given to some the gift of tongues, to others prophecy, &c., had conferred on him the gift of *forgetting* confessions.”¹

The decided expression of public opinion caused Father Cotton to make an effort, surpassing in impudence anything of the kind on record. Accompanied by two other Jesuits, he went to the attorney-general, and, in the name of his Company, entreated him to sanction the publication of an apology, with a prohibition for all persons, of what quality soever, to contradict or reply to it. The application was too monstrous to be received.²

Henry IV. left his heart, by will, to the Jesuit-college at La Flèche.³ It was a barbarous demand for the Jesuits to make : but, in granting it, Henry was doubtless actuated by his usual political finesse. And if, to

¹ Ravaillac said that he told D'Aubigny, in confession, that he desired to strike some great blow, and showed him a knife with a heart engraved upon it.—*Anti-Cotton*, referring to the *Interrogatoire de Ravaillac*. ² Browning, 207.

³ Alluding to this gift of his heart, the following verses conclude the famous diatribe against the Jesuits, called *Anti-Cotton*—

“ Si vous voulez que vôtre Etât soit ferme,
Chassez bien loin ces Tygres inhumains,
Qui, de leur Roi accourcissant le terme,
Se sont payés de son cœur par leurs mains.”

On the other hand, the Jesuit Alexander Donatus consecrates a sort of lament to his Company's benefactor—

“ At tibi (finitimæ fors ò lacrymabilis oræ)
Henrici ante diem mors astitit. Improba tantum
Ausa nefas ? regale latus transfigere ferro
Quæ potuit, Gallis nondum saturata ruinis ? ” &c.

Carmin. lib. ii. 249.

Another merely says—

“ Ferri indignantis rabido Rex occidit ictu
Aurea quod revocet, ferrea secla fuget.”

Alois, Cent. Epigram. 21.

the very last, the Spaniards were thorns in his sides, in spite of the mighty hopes he had put forth of being able to play them off by means of *his* Jesuits, the parliamentarians instinctively seized the occasion to denounce their hitherto triumphant opponents. In the absence of all proof, they accused the Jesuits of the murder ; and to the latest posterity the name of Ravaiillac will always be connected with the Jesuits. This is the result of the bad company they notoriously kept, and the pernicious doctrines which they gave to the world, sanctioned by the seal of the Company. When their highest officials are known, by their own admissions, to have associated intimately with such abandoned miscreants as Catesby and Guy Fawkes ; when their leaders are known, by proof positive—as in the case of the English Jesuits, headed by Parsons—to have scrupled at no iniquity for the accomplishment of their designs—the blackest calumny and cruelty, with falsehood in every shape ; when these men are nevertheless found to be venerated as patterns of virtue, yea, as saints on earth, if not in heaven :—though we may deem the Jesuits not directly incriminated in the guilt of Henry's blood, yet the possibility—nay, the probability—must linger in the mind ; and if we may not say, with Fra Paolo, that “the Jesuits are all flint, and their consciences darkened,” still, we have already read enough to prove that not a few of them exhibited these qualities to a deplorable extent. Doubtless it was, and is, apparently unfair to proscribe the whole Company for the crimes of certain leaders ; but the world has been, with ample reason, terrified and disgusted by the prominent specimens of leaders sent forth by the Society of Jesus—and howsoever we may lament the notion, it must still cling to us

stubbornly—and the name of Jesuit will always arouse suspicion.

Pierre Rousard wrote the following sonnet to the Jesuits, in the *Satyre Menippée*. I have endeavoured in vain adequately to translate it :—

“Sainete Societé dont on a faiet eslite
 Pour monster aux humains les mystères cachées,
 Pour repurger les maux dont ils sont entachés,
 Et pour remettre sus notre eglise destruite ;
 Mignons de Jesus Christ, qui par vostre merite
 Avez desjà si bien amorcé nos peschés
 Que l'on se peut venter que là où vous pêchez
 Pour un petit poisson vous tirez une truite
 Secretaires de Dieu, l'Eglise et les humains,
 Et Dieu et Jesus Christ vous prient à jointes mains,
 De retirer vos rets hors de leur mer profonde :
 Car vous pourriez enfin par vostre feint esprit
 Prescher, prendre, amorcer, et bannir de ce monde
 L'Eglise, les humains, et Dieu et Jesus Christ.”

The ingenious and sensible Capefigue, in his theory of Action, Reaction, and Transaction—his terms applied to the Reformation, the League, and the reign of Henry IV., entertains us with some plausible remarks on the events which ended in the murder of the convert Huguenot ; and he justly observes that “posterity does not ratify the judgments of parties,”—alluding to the implication of the Jesuits in that murder, and affirming that posterity “cannot accuse the Jesuits of Ravallac’s enormity.” He probably means that the Jesuits should not bear the blame exclusively,—for he immediately says :—“When a man, profoundly devoted to a religious or political conviction, sees before him a king who destroys or persecutes that conviction, then there is lighted up within him a parricidal flame ; he perceives ancient examples, he sees posterity applauding the part performed by a republican Brutus or a Catholic martyr. Now

let that idea have full swing—it needs no accomplices—it points out to the dagger the heart it has to strike. Such was, doubtless, Ravailiac : he extinguished in the life of Henry IV. the system of toleration and moderation which was irksome to the ardent Catholics.”¹ Alas ! is not this very exposition the whole front of the offending ? Who advanced—who promoted that frightfully inhuman “idea” ? Whom have we seen the bold and whelming paladins of that “idea ?” Who are the men who, even at the very time in question, were exerting themselves to the utmost, in order to abolish that “system of toleration and moderation which was irksome to the ardent Catholics” of Germany ? The Jesuits. And, unquestionably, if we budge an inch from the question of guilt by *actual proof*, to the question of guilt by *doctrinal inculcation* in all its bearings, we may pronounce the Jesuits concomitantly responsible for that murder, as well as all the “religious” iniquity of the Catholic movement.

In the midst of the excitement produced by the murder, there appeared the famous pamphlet entitled, “*Anti-Cotton*, wherein it is proved that the Jesuits are guilty, and the authors of the execrable parricide committed on the person of the Most Christian King Henry IV. of happy memory.” It was put forth in the same year, 1610, and vast was the impression it made. Edition after edition, and in all languages, circulated through the world, everywhere finding readers and approval. Cardinal Du Perron, though a friend of the Company on many occasions, said that “it was well done,” adding, that “no book hitherto written against the Jesuits damaged them so much ;” and superadding, by way of explanation, “They are too ambitious ; they

¹ La Ligue et Henri IV., *in fine*.

conspire against everything.”¹ The publication originated from a letter put forth by the Jesuit Cotton, a few weeks after the murder of the King, and entitled “A Declaratory Letter on the Doctrine of the Jesuit Fathers respecting the Life of Kings, according to the Decrees of the Council of Constance.” It bore his name, and was dedicated to the Queen Regent. It was, of course, an attempt to rebut public opinion, then lacerating the “fame of the Company.” An English translation appeared simultaneously at London. Thereupon the “Anti-Cotton” rushed forth with ruinous assault. It was a significant fact, that the Jesuits had interest enough with the authorities who now swayed the sceptre of the murdered king, to prosecute the bookseller who vended the work, to get him condemned, his copies torn to pieces in his presence, and himself banished the kingdom for five years. The Jesuits had the conscience to hold up this proceeding as a fact which necessarily showed the book to be false and infamous; but they nevertheless put forth numerous “refutations,”—the famous Cretan Jesuit, Eudæmon Joannes, again taking the field, and the illustrious Isaac Casaubon shivering a lance in the glorious skirmish. A slight analysis of the work will show that, at the time in question, it was adapted to damage the Company. It consists of five chapters. The first exhibits the regicidal doctrines of the Jesuits, then before the world,—not without striking and apposite applications to events then rife in the memories of men, particularly the Powder Action in England. Garnet had appointed prayers for the success of “an enterprise of the greatest

¹ “Ce livre est bien fait, et il ne s’est fait livre contre eux qui les ruine tant; ils sont trop ambitieux et entreprennent sur tout.”—*Perroniana*, 19; *Anti-Cotton*.

importance to the Catholic cause, at the meeting of Parliament ;” and the Jesuit Eudæmon said, in his Apology, that Garnet “did not approve of the deed, but liked the result” that might have followed.¹ “As who should say, that he did not approve of the murder of the king and royal family, but was very willing to see that accomplishment. It is by such subtleties and sophisms that they say one thing, and unsay it in the same line. These are the heroic deeds for which Garnet and Oldcorne, executed for the same treason, are called martyrs by Bellarmine, and by that Apology of the Jesuit L’Heureux, sanctioned by the general of the Order, Aquaviva, and by three doctors of the Company ;—and those Jesuits are inserted in the catalogue of Jesuit Martyrs, lately printed at Rome. Hence the kings and princes of Christendom will maturely consider in what security they can henceforward live, since the people are instructed by those doctors to seek the glory of martyrdom by assassination. And all good Catholics will be shocked and justly grieved to see the sacred name of martyr, so honourable in the church, conferred, now-a-days, on the parricides of kings and traitors.”² The second chapter brings the various regicidal attempts in France, in illustration of the doctrinal inculcations, and hits intensely with the fact that “the late king, who never felt fear in war, feared the Jesuits. The Duke de Sully can bear witness, that when dissuading the king from recalling the Jesuits, Henry IV. exclaimed, ‘*Then guarantee my life.*’”³ Their

¹ “Neque vero, ob eam rem, *Factum* probabat, sed amabat *Eventum*.”—320.

² Anti-Cotton, 116, 119.

³ In effect, Du Plessis, the Protestant, writing to De la Fontaine at London, in exculpation of the alleged share of the Protestants in the recall of the Jesuits, says :—“We did not in any way demand it ; indeed, it would not become us so

machinations against our Elizabeth are not forgotten—"and they lacerate her memory with abuse now that she is dead, exasperated because she would not permit herself to be murdered:—the Jesuit Bonarscius, in his *Amphitheatrum*, calls her the English she-wolf; and the Jesuit Eudæmon Joannes, in his Apology for Garnet, styles her *the daughter of her sister, the niece of her father.*"¹ And the keen-witted Anti-Cotton throws out a very striking hint, saying, "The house of Austria alone has the privilege of being exempt from the conspiracies of this Company. The life of the princes of this family is sacred and inviolate to the Jesuits."² Chapter the third enters into particular antecedents of the late assassination, and Father Cotton is shown to have consulted or put questions to a demoniac girl as to the king's life—a frivolous affair, but consider the times, and imagine its importance in the question.³ Nay, Father Cotton actually introduced to the king a Spaniard sent from Spain to murder the

to do. But the truth is, that we do not fear them as to their teaching, but only on account of *the king's person and the kingdom*. Being parties in the measure, we share the responsibility of all that ensues. God grant that his Majesty's prudence may always rise above these spiritual malignities, which have been so often experienced."—*Lettres et Mem.* 47, Ed. Amst. 1652.

¹ Anti-Cotton, 127-8, referring to the chapter and page of the works he quotes.

² Ibid. p. 130.

³ This is really no joke as to the fact of consultation. The devil was much in vogue among the religionists and politicians of those times. The "History of the Devils of Loudon" is a sad affair; but the great, the learned, as well as the vulgar, gave into the imposture. It was in 1629 that Grandier, curate of Loudon, was burnt alive as a magician, but in reality a victim to private hostility.—See Bayle, *Grandier*. The questions which Cotton, according to the custom of Rome's exorcists, put to the devil in the girl, were published by Bongars, one of king's ministers.—See Bayle, *Bongars*.—Cardinal Richelieu sent exorcists to Loudon to free some nuns from the devil in the seventeenth century, and in our own times, within twelve years since, a similar affair edified the devotees at Rome, when a poor girl played the demoniac. Dr. Wiseman was at Rome at the time, and witnessed the performance.

king: when letters apprised the king of the man's intention, and Cotton was required to produce the cut-throat, he pretended that he could not find him anywhere.¹ And when Ravailac was asked, "If it was lawful to kill a tyrant," he knew all the Jesuitical evasions and distinctions, as all the commissioners who examined him can attest. When they asked him who had stirred him to the attempt, he told them "they might have learnt, by the *sermons of their preachers*, all the causes for which it was necessary to kill the king."² What an extraordinary fact it was, that "at Brussels and at Prague, where the Jesuits are reigning, people spoke of the death of the king twelve or fifteen days *before it happened!* At Rouen many received letters from Brussels, written by their friends, wishing to know whether the rumour of the king's death was true, though it had not chanced as yet;" and a personage is named, who could attest such information beforehand from a Jesuit at Prague. Moreover, "many persons remarked the general disgust and indignation which prevailed when the Jesuits were seen at the Louvre, on the morning after the murder, smiling and

¹ Anti-Cotton, 133, *et seq.*

² It is recorded that suspicions of danger to the king were afloat for several months before the event. Du Plessis informed the King and Sully of a strange book at La Flèche, containing many signatures, several written in blood. The person who procured signatures belonged to the Sodality of the Jesuits. Concluding the letter, Du Plessis says, "the least things in matters of state are not to be neglected, and they very often enable us to dive into the greatest." At the same time, according to the same most respectable authority, and in a document addressed to the Queen of France, we read of "these sermons so licentious of the Jesuits, which are delivered everywhere, and even at Paris, and which, in times past, have been the forerunners of calamities to the realm."—*Lettres*, Oct. 30, 1609, and p. 212. Ed. Amst. 1652. See the *Mercure Français*, tome i., which published the regicide's examination, for his motives: he expressly mentions the seditious sermons he heard.—Bayle, *Mariana*, [K.]

bold, and presented to the queen by Monsieur de la Varenne, their benefactor and restorer.”¹ After the death of the king, two Jesuits exerted themselves to prevent the Maréchal de la Chastre, the general of the forces, from marching to the aid of the German princes—the heretics—as Henry IV. had commanded.²

The fourth chapter is an exceedingly conclusive refutation of Father Cotton’s Epistle to the Queen :—as a specimen take the following :—“ It is in vain that he alleges many Jesuit authors who condemn regicide ; for all these passages of Jesuits speak of kings *whom the pope and the Jesuits acknowledge as kings* :—but we have shown, by very many Jesuit authors, and by their actions, that, when the Jesuits have attempted the life of a king, they advance in their justification, that they do not consider such a man as king, though he bears the name—because he is excommunicated, or because he is an enemy of the Church :—and, in effect, the wretch Ravailiac alleged this as the cause of his crime, namely, that the king intended to wage war against the pope, and that the pope was God, and, consequently, that the king intended to wage war against God—the very words of the interrogatory.”³ Father Cotton, like Garnet, might condemn the deed, but desired its result—the death of the king, which forfended the deprecated calamity.⁴ All Cotton’s arguments are “two-edged swords—cutting at both sides—for he says :—‘ All the

¹ Anti-Cotton, 142, *et seq.* “To this Monsieur de Varenne, the Jesuits were principally indebted for their recall,” says a note to the Anti-Cotton, “and for their establishment at La Flèche : nor could De Varenne fail of success, considering his employment of *Grand Fourrier d’Amour*, Postillon Général de Venus auprès de Henri IV., and master or minister of the king’s debaucheries, as the historians of the time designate him.”

² *Ut supra*, 144.

³ *Ibid.* 146.

⁴ *Ibid.* 148.

Jesuits, in general and in particular, will sign a declaration, even with their own blood, that they hold, in this matter and in every other, no other faith, doctrine, and opinion, but that of the Roman Church.’ In this assertion, Cotton speaks against his conscience: for, if the individuals of the Company are of one accord in all things, it follows that Cotton and Mariana are of one accord, and that Cotton is wrong in condemning him”— unquestionably a very home thrust, whilst the Jesuit recoils—a palpable hit. “And as to what he says that all the Jesuits will subscribe to the doctrine of the universal Church, I reply, that the Jesuits will readily subscribe to anything—because they have mental reservations and hidden salvos, which they reserve in their minds: but I am well assured that the universal Church will not subscribe to any of those abominable sentences of the Jesuits, quoted in chapter the first from their books, and will still less approve of their deeds.”¹

The last chapter of this ruinous assault levels a terrible cannonade against Father Cotton himself. Admitting that Cotton is exempt from the crime, that the Jesuits Gontier and D’Aubigny had not imparted to him Ravaiillac’s design, that he was not in correspondence with the Jesuits of Brussels—still his morals and profession render it improper that he should be near the person of the young King Louis XIII.² “I say that Cotton, who calls himself a Religious, even of a Company which assumes the name of Jesus, is a source of scandal to the whole Church—being always at the court. For this is contrary, not only to the regulations of all monks, but particularly to the rules of the Jesuits. . . . It is one of the faults of Father Cotton that he entertained

¹ *Ubi supra*, 152, *et seq.*

² *Ut antea*, 160.

the pleasures of the late king, instead of restraining them: whilst Henry was such, that if a man who opposed vice, had filled the place of Father Cotton, it would have been easy to restrain him"—an assertion by no means probable to all intents and purposes: but it was a sad blot on the religious fame of the Company, that a Jesuit habitually absolved and saw the disgusting profligacy of the king, and listened to his jests, which he sometimes answered by equivocation—as for instance, when asked by his royal penitent, in the presence of the courtiers, what he would do if placed in a strong temptation, which the king particularised, the Jesuit replied: “I know what I *ought to do*, sire, but I know not what I *would do*.”¹ Apparently, in order to varnish this connection, the Jesuits say, that Father Cotton, in the midst of that immodest court, lived in such purity, that he could, by a peculiar sense, discover when such persons as came near him, had violated the laws of chastity. This Jesuit-faculty must have been intensely irritated by the king himself.² It was certainly a miracle if Cotton was an exception to the unblushing licentiousness of that court:—but though we pass over the charges brought against him, a doubt must ever remain, that he who so unscrupulously absolved, did rigidly abstain from, the particular deeds in question. Again, this is the result

¹ Tallement, *Historiettes*, iv. 200. Bassompierre exclaimed:—“Il ferait le devoir de l'homme, et non pas celui de père Cotton.”—*Ibid*.

² Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu. See Bayle for other Jesuit-curiosities on the subject.—Art. *Mariana* [C.] With regard to Cotton, these are the words of the biographer:—“Sensus frænabat accuratâ custodiâ, et horrore quodam impuritatis, quam etiam in iis qui se illâ fædâssent, ex *graveolentiâ* nescio quâ discernibat.” The reader will probably be reminded of the description usually given of Henry IV. in connection with the *graveolentia* nescio quæ of the Jesuit. See Tallement, i. 81, for the facts, which cannot be quoted even in the original. Capefigue also mentions the peculiarity, which seems to have descended to his son Louis XIII.—Tallement, *Henri IV.*, i. 81.

of the fact, that the Jesuits would keep bad company : if birds of a feather do not flock together, the Jesuit Cotton should have been nested somewhere else.

The Anti-Cotton concludes with the quotation, that "The Company of the Jesuits is a sword whose scabbard is France, but whose hilt is in Spain or at Rome, where the general resides." In effect, the Jesuits themselves have, as it were, countenanced all the terrors of mankind, resulting from their supposed regicidal propensities. In their Church of St. Ignatius, at Rome, they painted, in the four corners of the cupola, subjects drawn from the Old Testament ; and these subjects are so many assassinations or murders, committed, in the name of God, by the Jewish people :—Jael, who, impelled by the Divine Spirit, drives a nail into Sisera's head, to whom she had offered hospitality :—Judith, who, conducted by the same guide, cuts off the head of Holofernes, after having seduced and made him drunk :—Samson, who massacres the Philistines, by order of the Almighty :—lastly, David, who slays Goliath. At the top of the cupola, St. Ignatius, in a glory, darts out flames on the four quarters of the world, with these words of the New Testament, "I came to set fire to the earth ; and what would I but that it be kindled !" —If anything could exhibit the spirit of the Company, with respect to the murderous doctrine imputed to it, these pictures would be a stronger proof of it than all the passages which are quoted from their authors, and which are common to the Jesuits and other doctrinal leaders : but the truth is, that these principles, supported in appearance by the Bible, ill-understood, are the principles of fanatics in all ages ; and we may add, of the greater part of any sect when they believe it to be their interest to propagate

them—and that they can preach them with impunity—as during the age in question. To them a heretic king was a tyrant, and of course a man whom religion and reason order us equally to “get rid of,”—as Ravallac gave the excuse of his conscience.¹

Although it was evident that the French government did not wish to investigate the question as to Ravallac’s accomplices : although it was manifest that a fair and public trial would have settled all doubts on the subject—yet it was thought proper to hasten the criminal out of the world, without any further inquiries as to the parties whom he named in his declarations. They needed some of James’s lawyers, or rather, it was well for them that they lacked them—since the highest in the land, as well as the Jesuits, might have been proved to have shared the guilt of the regicide. The Parliament ordered Mariana’s book to be publicly burnt, and the Sorbonne renewed its condemnation of the regicidal doctrines :—but there the matter rested—and the Jesuits went on as usual, scribbling against Anti-Cotton, and consolidating the “result” of the assassination.²

They still remained at Court, in favour with the Queen ; and the discarded mistress of Henry IV. continued to smile upon them as fair as ever ; whilst their

¹ D’Alembert, *Destruction des Jesuites*, p. 84.

² See voluminous details on the matter in the work entitled *Les Jesuites Criminels de Lese-Majesté*, and all the French histories of the Jesuits ; also, Browning’s *Huguenots*, chap. 52. With regard to the guilty share of the Jesuits in the murder, Browning’s remarks are as follows :—“There would be a cruel injustice in contributing to perpetuate this sentiment, in the absence of regular evidence, if the Jesuits had not subsequently been in a situation which enabled them to justify the reputation of their body. The two succeeding kings had Jesuits for confessors ; and although everything tended to facilitate the elucidation of this event, not the least effort was made to render public the investigations and statements, which the Parliament in 1610 had consigned to secrecy.”—*Ibid.* 207.

Father Caussin directed his wits to astrology for the enlightenment of the Queen regent, and his own edification. Like Burton, of melancholy memory, he predicted his own death by astrology, and, according to Tallement, on the appointed day, though in health, he laid him down on his bed and died.¹

In the midst of the endless assaults which the Jesuits suffered on all sides—from Catholics as well as Protestants—it was certainly a clever expedient to hold Catholics in check by getting the Company's founder enrolled among the saints of the Church. It would scarcely beseem an obedient child of the Church to find fault with the work of a saint in heaven;—and so the Jesuits had long resolved to get admission for Ignatius into the “Paradise of”—Rome. Had it not been for this clever expedient of the Jesuits, the voluminous denunciations of their modern opponent *Gioberti* would have been much less inconsistent than they are—for, being compelled, for the sake of that “orthodoxy” which he is anxious to display, to venerate Ignatius, and Xavier, and Borgia, he has filled his prodigious volumes with interminable rhetoric, so wearisome, that he tires us into disgust with the Jesuits, simply because they are the cause of the voluminous production—whose

¹ Historiettes, ii. 183. The Queen Regent, says Tallement, was a great believer in these predictions, and she was enraged when they assured her that Cardinal Richelieu would prosper and live a long time. She also believed that those large flies which buzz about in summer, hear what is said, and go and repeat it; whenever she saw them, she would never talk secrets. The Jesuits had a man for every fate and office, and position; and Father Caussin was astrologer to the court of France. It was said, but of course denied by the Jesuits, that Cotton invented a certain mirror, or reflector, which conveyed to Henry IV. all the secrets of all the cabinets in Europe. This was probably an allegorical exposition of the *Jesuit-espionage throughout the world of politics*.—See *Bayle*, viii. 617, b.

facts are mere unity, as it were, whilst his frothy, but “orthodox” argumentation is truly infinite.¹

It was in 1609 that the Jesuits induced Paul V. to beatify Ignatius. The pope had not been able to get the Jesuits included in the reconciliation which he had arranged with the Venetians. Glad to find an opportunity for mitigating the disgrace of that banishment, which was the immediate result of their devotedness to the popedom, Paul V. most graciously listened to the humble prayer which his well-beloved sons, Claudio Aquaviva, and all his companions, laid at his holy feet. A breve was forthwith expedited, granting the prayer of their petition, and henceforth mass might be said to the honour of the broken-down Knight of Pampeluna, in all the churches of the Company, as to a confessor of the faith, on every 31st of July, the day of Inigo’s departure from his “toil and trouble,” as has been related at the end of my first volume, quoting the Jesuits themselves, and with very small edification.

Vast and pompous was the display to celebrate that glorious beatification. Ridiculous panegyrics fed the ravenous devotees to suffocation; and the Sorbonne of Paris cruelly came forward to condemn such harmless absurdities as the following:—“Ignatius, with his name

¹ *Il Gesuita Moderno*, in five vols. demy 8vo. 1847. The Evangelicals have got hold of Gioberti, and given him a splendid mausoleum in *The Christian Observer*, for the present month of June, *quod vide*, 379—

“But who is he, in closet closely-pent,
Of sober face, with learned dust besrent?
Right well mine eyes arede the myster wight,
On parchment scrapes y-fed, and Wormius hight.
To future ages may thy dulness last,
As thou preserv’st the dulness of the past!”

written upon paper, performed more miracles than Moses, and as many as the Apostles." "The life of Ignatius was so holy and exalted, even in the opinion of heaven, that only popes, like St. Peter, empresses, like the mother of God, some other sovereign monarchs, as God the Father and His Holy Son, enjoyed the bliss of seeing him." These propositions were condemned by the quondam regicidal Sorbonne, which pronounced these devotional platitudes "scandalous, erroneous, blasphematory, impious, execrable, detestable, false, and manifestly heretical,"—although the cunning Jesuits got three monks to deliver the sentiments, whilst the French Jesuit Solier piously translated them, as being "very excellent" for the edification of the faithful and the fame of the Company. Solier attacked the censure of the Sorbonne, and the Company went on urging the saint's *canonisation*—which is the second stage of sanctity after beatification—somewhat like the dressing of leather after tanning.

Now, since the year 1232 of the ages of faith, Rome would not canonise any one without attested miracles—a sad decree, for it became the "proximate occasion" of all manner of pious fraud and perjury. Miracles, then, were absolutely necessary for the canonisation of this Catholic, who would perversely die without the sacraments. There was the difficulty; for, in the two editions of his Life, before the world, one sanctioned by Borgia, the other by Aquaviva himself, and considerably enlarged, Ribadeneyra had, as we have read, not only stated the absence of miraculous powers in Ignatius, but undertook to show that they were not necessary, or that the Order and its achievements were equivalents; but these were not precisely the promissory notes by Rome

required—nor could these be found in that chapter of Maffeus, wherein he tells of “certain marvellous things concerning Ignatius.” Difficulties vanish at the command of the Jesuits : they cut the Gordian knot without a moment’s hesitation. And they made Ribadeneyra belie himself as expediently as James I. had done by his secretary, Balmerino, in the sad affair of the letter to the pope. Ribadeneyra published another Life of the founder in 1612, with a great number of miracles, excusing their previous omission, because, said he, they had not appeared sufficiently certain and attested. This was, of course, palpable chicanery : he had positively intimated that Ignatius had performed no miracles at all. But the Jesuits were dominant at Rome—*stet pro ratione voluntas* was the command, and they began to collect miracles accordingly in all parts of the habitable world, where the angels of the Company were at their posts in readiness—

“All in a moment through the gloom were seen,
Ten thousand banners rise into the air
With orient colours waving.”

Japan, China, Mexico, Peru, Chili, Brazil, Abyssinia, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, Poland, Hungary, and Flanders, furnished them fifty times more miracles than they needed to set their limping founder on his legs of saintship. More than two hundred miracles are now recorded in the various biographers—which admit of no exception whatever in their impious and disgusting absurdity. Ignatius was made miraculously to appear to Xavier in India and to rout by his presence a mighty host of the Infidels ;—and he condescended to raise a *hen* to life, which was accidentally drowned. When the

words: "St. Ignatius bring the hen to life," were pronounced, she came to life—but quite a changed creature, for, ever after she lived like a nun, apart from the other hens, and the lords of the roost. Bartoli gives more than one hundred; and the Bull of Canonisation signalled the most stupendous,—when, in 1621, Gregory XV. yielded to the Jesuit-stirred acclamation and sanctified Ignatius, together with Francis Xavier. Louis XIII. of France, the Emperor Ferdinand, the King or Duke of Bavaria, and other royal and princely patrons of the Jesuits, were induced to join "the prayer of their petition." Bonfires and roaring cannon proclaimed the dirty deed accomplished; and in every province of the Company the most extravagant rejoicings celebrated the unblushing roguery of the Jesuits.¹ At Douay they erected four galleries in the two streets leading to their church. These were supported by a hundred compartments and columns, Doric and Ionic, on which were suspended four hundred and fifty paintings in oil, one hundred and seventy of which were three feet high and two and a half in breadth, enriched with gilt frames most beautiful. The two first represented the exploits and miracles of Ignatius and Xavier; the others were portraits of the most distinguished members and martyrs of the Company; and under each portrait was a quatrain of verses highly ornamented, displaying the appropriate doggerel, of which I have given a specimen when describing Everard Mercurian, the third general of the Jesuits.²

Everywhere there were grand processions, from the

¹ See *Hist. de Dom Inigo* for details, ii. p. 193—210.


² *Tableaux des Personnages, &c. exposés en la Canonization des SS. Ignace et F. Xavier; célébrée par le Collège de la Comp. à Douay, 1623.*

24th to the 31st of July. The images of Inigo and Xavier were borne about in triumph to the sound of trumpets, alternated by musicians singing hymns and canticles in honour of the Cæsar and the Alexander of the spiritual knight-errantry. Their churches displayed gorgeous ornaments, magnificent hangings, costly pictures, brilliant illuminations—in a word, nothing was spared to make a Paradise for Ignatius, on earth at least. Large letters in gold, on pillars, proclaimed the names of the regions where the Company of Jesus had, in such and such a year, planted the faith Catholic—India, Japan, Brazil, Ethiopia, Monomatopa, Mexico, Guinea, Peru, the empire of Mogul, China, all the world over.

The courts of their colleges were not less decorated than their churches. Triumphal arches, statues, pyramids covered from top to bottom with enigmas, emblems and anagrams, whose hidden meaning their scholars set their wits to unravel—all for ever and ever on the marvellous deeds of Inigo and the portentous Xavier.

They performed tragedies and sang pastorals in their honour; and finished off the diurnal festivities with fire-works from “flaming dragons,” doubtless, with thousands of rockets and fusees, some like serpents, others like stars—all intensely brilliant and turning night into day.

St. Germain happened to occupy in the saint’s calendar, the 31st of July:—the resistless Jesuits expelled him to make room for the incomparable Inigo; and France would have looked in vain for her venerable *bishop*, had the pious Parliament of Paris not interfered and decreed his restoration. What wonderful men were these Jesuits! Pagans they ousted, Protestants they dragooned, their own Catholic brethren they oppressed



and tormented, and now, like “the fox that thrusts out the badger,” they drive out a bishop from the saintship of that city which first “made room” for their founder and his nine companions.¹

Aquaviva had gone to his rest eight years before this glorious event : the general died in 1615.

Four-and-thirty years he ruled the Company, amidst perils of every kind—assailed incessantly from without, and incessantly disordered within. He had foiled his rebellious subjects ; but left them unchanged :—thenceforward he treated the aristocrats with deference, permitted factions in the Company, who, with a nominal subjection to the chief, pursued their independent measures. If the French Jesuits held more directly to the general, the same cannot be said of the Spanish and English members, who, in the last years of his reign, were independent sections of the Company, with whom the “order of holy obedience” was but the shadow of a name. The period through which hitherto the Company has passed, is styled her age of iron, and that which ensues is called her age of gold. Expanding like every well-timed speculation, ready for every enterprise, with men adapted for every post, the Company was now fairly or foully established over earth. Her external developments have passed before us like the scenes of a drama—sometimes ghastly, at other times ridiculous, occasionally beneficent—but the supposed good effected by the Jesuits in the apparent restoration of Catholicism, cannot compensate for the woes which, on unimpeachable authorities, they stand convicted of having inflicted on large sections of mankind.

In contemplating the march of such wonderful apostles

¹ Hist. de Dom Inigo, livre vii.

in the distant land of the savage, with such marvellous results effected in their annual letters, we naturally long to see the traces of their evangelical foot-marks where verification is easy. The book of history must become our “edifying and curious letters.” Our object is to discover, if possible, the good influence of Jesuitism among the Christians of Europe, and among the Europeans in the land of the savage—during that period extending from the foundation of their Company to the epoch where we linger awhile, advancing to the middle of the seventeenth century—a period of a hundred years, which constitute the main history of the rise, progress, and culmination of the Jesuits. In the introduction to this history I have faithfully represented the moral, or, rather, the immoral features of the preceding age; the succeeding half century exhibited no radical difference. Learning and wit were patronised by the great: virtue and morality were secondary, if not utterly disregarded. The casuistical maxims of the Jesuits, rife throughout the period, reflect the morality of the masses whom they led in their path of salvation: if they could not make men saints, they did their best to prevent them from accounting themselves sinners, so mild was the law of the confessional, so wide the confines of its exemptions, permissions, and dispensations. In that age of analysis, keen investigation in every branch of knowledge, mathematics, and universal nature, had their indefatigable students, eager to discover and expand their inventions—the former had a Vieta, the latter a Gesner;—and anatomy also had its patient students and minute elucidators—Fallopian and Eustachius had consecrated their names respectively to organs of the human system, which they discovered, or whose functions

they explained. The Jesuits applied the same analysis to moral science—inventing or expanding their endless definitions and distinctions in the matter of sin, until it seems difficult to offend against Christian morality. But their object was not to corrupt mankind : it was only to “keep pace with the age”—to render obedience to the orthodox Church as easy as the assumed license of the heretics ;—or it was only to rival those teachers of the science whom they found in possession of the field. It was the cloister that was ever the most fruitful parent of casuists. Dominicans, Augustinians, Franciscans—from Thomas Aquinas, the heavy angel of the schools, down to Ligorio, the last of the tribe, I believe, there has been but one leading principle wherewith the casuists strove for eminence in the despicable art of fooling the consciences of men. The principle was, to consider a thing, first, according to its essence, and then, according to its circumstances or adjuncts. The method is necessary in geometry, where the exactness of calculation is based on abstract relations ; but it cannot be admitted in morals, where we cannot pronounce on an action until it is really committed. Now, the casuists applied that method to morals. Is it a mortal sin to kill ? Not in itself, since a soldier, a traveller who is attacked, and others similarly placed, may kill. Then follow all manner of distinctions, in the train of casuistry. But the hideous details in other matters ! We cannot see, without indignation, priests, doctors, men who have renounced the intercourse of women, yet enlarging, with a sort of satisfaction, on all the disorders which result from that intercourse. We shrink with horror when we see them exposing to the public, in books printed with approbation, those horrible details

which the most systematic licentiousness confines to obscurity.

Then comes the tempting distinction about "directing the intention," after frittering away the broad principles of right and wrong. If a man sinned, his conscience felt no burthen: his "right intention" bore the load for him.

Emmanuel Sa, Cornelius à Lapide, Gaspar Hurtado, James Gordon, Suarez, Vasquez, Henriquez, and Toledo, led the way or journeyed together with the never-to-be-forgotten Escobar, so desperately transfixed by Pascal. Their maxims were comfortable to the consciences of the age. Who has not heard of the "probable opinions" of the casuists? But few have considered how expedient they were at a time, when leaders required headlong, mentally blind agents for any given work that might disturb a common conscience. And then it was that the indulgent casuists described a sort of sin called "philosophical," which did not interfere with the grace of sanctification.

Perjury, duelling, falsehood in all its ramifications, murder and violence—every crime might be made safe to conscience by some casuist or another. There are other misdemeanours too foul to name—disgusting beyond endurance. In reading the passages—not in the famous "extracts," but in the original authors, I knew not whether to wonder more at the astonishing *physiological* inquiries which these bachelor casuists must have made, than the shameless effrontery with which the immundities are minutely described.

It is not my intention to quote these casuists. To know that the plague exists in a certain locality is sufficient, without importing some desperate cases by way of specimen.

Long before the French Parliament, in 1762, made a collection of these moral developments, the Jesuit John de Alloza had performed a similar task, *con amore* indeed, and with the labour of thirty years—but still leaving the foul stables inexhausted. He entitled his compilation “Flowers of the Sums, or the Moral Alphabet, in which almost all the cases of conscience which may occur to confessors, are briefly, clearly, and as far as is lawful, *mildly* digested—from the more select doctors, chiefly of the Company of Jesus.” The edition I quote has, at the end, the propositions condemned by Pope Alexander VII. in 1664-5 : but the whole, with all its immundities, is dedicated “to the Blessed Virgin conceived without sin.”¹

And what is the excuse for these revolting details? Why, that the confessor is a judge, &c. Be it so:—but must chaste ears be soiled in learning how chastity may be depraved? May they not dispense with certain lights so dangerous to themselves—so harassing—so *suggestive*?

Though the Jesuits overdid their share in casuistry, still it must never be forgotten that the Catholic casuists are a numerous body, and extend through all the monkhood of the Church—nor have we to read far in the last edition of Ligorio, in 1845, to find abominations. In fact, Escobar says, in his preface, that he has not maintained a single proposition which cannot be confirmed by the “greatest divines” *out* of the Company.

Much of this immorality is to be ascribed to the

¹ “Flores Summarum, sive Alphabetum Morale, quo omnes ferè conscientiæ casus, qui Confessariis contingere possunt, clarè, breviter ac quantum licet benignè digeruntur, ex selectioribus doctoribus, præcipuè Societate Jesu,” &c.—“*Dedicatio ad B. Virginem sine maculâ conceptam.*” Ed. Colon. 1669.

practice of sacramental confession ; for, when the conscientious conviction of simple right and wrong is deemed insufficient to determine guilt, the specious, interested distinctions of man run riot in the darkened chambers of the heart's desires. The broad and visible road of right and wrong is cut up into a thousand intersecting bye-paths, and the tyrant-will of the usurper who sits in the confessional permits or forbids the deeds of the deluded creature of that God whose right he has usurped ;—allowing him to luxuriate or not in those perilous bye-ways, just as his own heart whispers him away—by weakness or by the moment's whim determined.

The Jesuits may have baptised millions of barbarians, but unquestionably they had very few true Christians in Christendom. They found men desperately wicked : they made them “orthodox,” rabidly orthodox—and that was the requirement of the times.

Consider the free-booters in whose ships these missionaries sped to preach Christ to the savages. With the Portuguese, this Company of Apostles co-operated in the subjugation of the barbarians. The “zeal” of the Jesuits fanned the flame of conquest, and it became ferocity. The invaders made no scruple of pillaging, cheating, and enslaving the idolaters—and meanwhile the Jesuits “superintended the royal castles,” as Acosta assures us. The King of Tidor was carried off from his own palace, and murdered with his children, whom he had entrusted to the care of the Portuguese. At Ceylon the people were not suffered to cultivate the land except for their new masters, who treated them with the greatest barbarity. At Goa they had established the Inquisition, at the suggestion of the Jesuits, and

soon, whoever was rich became a prey to the ministers of the infamous tribunal.

Antonio de Faria, who was sent out against the pirates, from Malacca, China, and other parts, made a descent on the island of Calampui, and plundered the sepulchres of the Chinese emperors.

Souza caused all the pagodas on the Malabar coast to be destroyed, and his men inhumanly massacred the wretched Indians who went to weep over the ruins of their temples.

Correa terminated an obstinate war with the King of Pegu ; and both parties were to swear on the book of their respective religion, to observe the treaty. Correa swore on a *Collection of Songs*, and thought, by this vile equivocation, to elude his engagement.

Diego de Silveira was cruising in the Red Sea. A vessel, richly laden, saluted him. The captain came on board, and gave him a letter from a Portuguese general, which was to be his passport. The letter contained only these words :—" *I desire the captains of ships belonging to the King of Portugal, to seize this Moorish vessel as a lawful prize.*"

In a short time, observes Raynal, ex-Jesuit, the Portuguese preserved no more humanity or good faith with each other, than with the natives. Almost all the states where they had command, were divided into factions. Avarice, debauchery, cruelty, and devotion, mixed together, prevailed everywhere in their manners. Most of them had seven or eight concubines, whom they kept to work with the utmost rigour, and forced from them the money they earned by their labour. The chiefs and principal officers admitted to their table a multitude of those singing and dancing women, with which India

abounds. Effeminacy demoralised families, and enervated armies. The officers marched to meet the enemy in palanquins. That brilliant courage which had subdued so many nations, existed no longer. The Portuguese were with difficulty brought to fight except there was a prospect of plunder. Peculation was general. Such corruption prevailed in the finances, that the tributes, the revenues of provinces, which ought to have been immense, the taxes levied in gold, silver, and spices, on the inhabitants of the continent and islands, were not sufficient to keep up a few citadels, and to fit out the shipping necessary for the protection of trade.¹

Among these men, in company with these men, the Jesuits went forth to convert the savages, whom, as we have read, they induced to comply with the fierce necessity which demanded their complete subjection. What, then, was the *moral* influence of the Jesuits with these "Christians" of Europe? Little or nothing; but the Jesuits were obliged to influence the poor, ignorant savages, so as to make them obedient subjects of the Portuguese and Spaniards. We shall find a somewhat different experiment in Paraguay; but that exception does not compensate for the general rule of Jesuit co-operation in the designs, the "idea" of the Portuguese and Spaniards. The Christians of France, the Christians of Germany, the Christians of England, the Christians of Italy, in the midst of whom the Jesuits taught, and preached, and gathered sodalities, have been witnessing the awful events which form the burthen of this and the previous books: and we may ask, was the influence of the Jesuits amongst them for good? With such examples as men beheld—such views as were proposed to generate

¹ Raynal, Hist. of the Indies, i. 206, *et seq.*

contention, how could Christian morality prevail? Assuredly, hitherto we cannot say that humanity has been benefited by the scheme of Loyola. The educational scheme and literature of the Jesuits will be presently considered. In concluding this "great" epoch of Jesuit story, we must glance at the government of the Company.¹

¹ In 1612 appeared the famous and popular work entitled *Monita Privata, or Secreta*—*The Private or Secret Instructions for the Superiors of the Company of Jesus*. The *Anti-Cotton*, the *Monita Secreta*, and the *Provincial Letters* of Pascal, are unquestionably the three anti-Jesuitical publications which have made the greatest impression on the public. The *Monita Secreta* is still a popular book, circulated, in an English translation, by the thousand—a zealous and cheap publication, intended for the defence of the Church of England, as exhibited in the proscription of Jesuitism. The history of the *Monita Secreta* is, according to the Jesuits, as follows: It was printed originally at Cracow, in 1612,—an expelled Jesuit, Zaorowski, was "presumed to be its author." The ex-Jesuit was then a parish priest at Gozdziec, in Poland; and, as the charge was not proved against him, the fact of its being made is one sample, at least, of the deeds recommended in the book—namely, the unscrupulous persecution of an ex-member. The modern Jesuit, Plowden, a man who seems to have emulated Parsons as far as he could, is excessively severe on this Zaorowski. Quoting the Jesuits Cordara and Gretzer, he boldly proclaims him to be author of the obnoxious publication, although the charge was not brought home to the man, when the bishops and other authorities were called upon to condemn the book, as containing all that is vile—a sentence which was not necessary, only so far as such a sentence could exonerate the Jesuits—which, of course, is doubtful. Jesuit Plowden, master of the English novices of the Company, thus denounces the unfortunate ex-Jesuit, to Laicus of the "Times" newspaper, in 1815. "Would you know, Sir, the origin of your despicable *Monita*? Not in the days of Lainez, not at the close, but in the early years of the seventeenth century, a Jesuit was dismissed with ignominy from the Society in Poland, an uncommon circumstance, but judged due to his misconduct. The walls of the city of Cracow were soon covered with sheets of revengeful insults; and in the year 1616, this outcast of the society published his fabricated *Secreta Monita*, with a view to cover his own disgrace, or to gratify his revenge."—*Letters of Clericus*, 2. Now all this is the usual Parsonian virulence. This "outcast, dismissed with ignominy," is called by his bishop "the venerable Jerome Zaorowski, parish priest in Gozdziec," and the charge is expressly stated to be a mere conjecture—"De authore quidem certo non constat: fama tamen fertur, et ex presumptionibus conjicitur, illum esse editum à venerabili Hieronymo Zaorowski Parocho in Gozdziec." Plowden must have seen the document here quoted, since it was published by the Jesuit Gretzer, who, he says, "victoriously refuted" the book, and expressly refers to Gretzer's

Mariana and his faction could do no good to the Company. Ranke perfectly describes the internal condition of the Company at this epoch of incipient gold, as Cretineau calls it ; and I shall transcribe his exposition

“refutation.” The fact is that the author was never discovered, and the Jesuits contented themselves with getting the book prohibited, and publishing “refutations,” as if such a work could really admit of “refutation”—being neither dogmatic nor historical, but simply a collection of maxims, “words to the wise” of the Company of Jesus, as alleged. The book was condemned by the Roman Index in 1616, “in a congregation holden in the palace of the most illustrious and most reverend Cardinal *Bellarmino*,” who, of course, was expected “to protect, by his credit, the Company which had brought him up with so much care,” as Aquaviva wrote to the brethren on Bellarmine’s promotion. See *Hist. de Dom Inigo*, ii. 134, *et seq.*, for the letter, which shows the hopes founded on that irregular exaltation. Still the book circulated, and did *not* meet “everywhere its merited contempt” as Plowden asserts :—another decree of the same Index was deemed expedient in 1621. See *Documents*, ii. *Des Monita Secreta*, p. 19. Various editions followed, and the apocryphal testament of the Jesuits was ever in vogue. There is a MS. copy in the library of the British Museum. These are the only facts worth mentioning on the “authenticity” of the book, except that *Aquaviva* himself was supposed to be its author. See Placcius (No. 1501), p. 369. The preface to an edition published in 1635 at Geneva, states the document to have been found either among the books when the Jesuit College at Paderborn was plundered by the Duke of Brunswick, or in the College of Prague, and that it was some Capuchin monks, to whom the aforesaid books were given, who discovered the curiosity among the papers of the Jesuit rector. All this was probably intended to mystify the terrible Jesuits in their pursuit of the editor or author. I shall give a brief analysis of the book, which the Protean “Father Prout” exquisitely calls “the mystic whisperings of the *Monita Secreta*,”—intimating, by the way, that they must be studied by every author who will “sit down to write about the Jesuits.”—*Prout’s Reliques*, i. 274. It will certainly be evident that many of their maxims apply to the known practice of the Jesuits : indeed, I believe that this was the intention of the editor—namely, to show forth the principles of Jesuit action. It may at once be conceded that the code was not sanctioned by any authority in the Company :—but, without supposing such principles to be prevalent in sections of the Company, it will be difficult to account for the conduct of Aquaviva’s own Jesuit-opponents, the conduct of the English Jesuits and Parsons, as we have read from undoubted authorities, as well as other facts and matter, their casuistry not excepted. Besides, the very name of the book was familiar to the Jesuits, Mercurian having written “*Monita*,” as I have stated ; and, especially, it must be remembered that all the regulations of the Company were not given to all the members, that numerous decrees are suppressed in the printed lists, and that though other rules might be written, the old Constitutions were to remain unchanged. I allude to these things merely to show

the more willingly, because he is represented by the partisans of the Jesuits as little short of an apologist :—they probably judge from garbled extracts, or the dishonest French translation of the German's admirable work.

that the Jesuits themselves have laid themselves open to the charge. To say that these *Monita* are too abominable to have been admitted for the guidance of the Jesuits, is to assume the very point at issue ; and certainly, even only hitherto, we have seen enough of certain Jesuits to believe that the principles of the *Monita Secreta* were their guides of conduct. The *Monita Secreta* consist of seventeen chapters, and the substance of the whole is as follows. The motive of all the professional labours of the Jesuits would be to recommend the Company to the people, particularly to the higher ranks ; always selecting rich cities for their foundations, practising on widows who had money—whilst they would constantly proclaim their *gratis*-prospectus. The utmost devotedness would be exhibited to princes and the great, humouring their desires with dispensations, and favouring their projects—yet in such a manner that there should always be some fathers who could shield the Company, in case of failure, by affirming that the charge of co-operation was false—they being ignorant of the facts. The favourites and domestics of kings would be conciliated—particularly princesses by their waiting-maids. The lax morality of the casuists would be used for the purpose of binding great lords to the confessors of the Company : invitations to sermons, harangues, dinners, and public disputations, the composition of verses, and the like, to their honour, would conduce to the same desirable end. Every effort would be made to gain favour with all persons in power, civil or ecclesiastical. The confessors of princes would treat their royal penitent with mildness and caresses—not shock them in sermons—but rather divest them of fear and exhort them chiefly to *faith, hope, and political justice*. They would endeavour to throw discredit on other religious orders, and strive for the monopoly of education : the defects of other competitors in the ministry would be investigated and published, and yet as it were deplorably. Very particular attention would be given to widows, and numerous are the means detailed to “do them.” How to entrap their sons, is answered by numerous expedients : prescriptions for increasing the revenues follow amain. The utmost severities would be enforced against members who might be found thwarting in any way the aforementioned “whisperings”—in order to induce them to resistance—and then to expel them “for not having the spirit of the Company,” if the question be asked. The most systematic persecution would incessantly torment the expelled members, who would be denounced in every possible way, far and near, and all their defects exaggerated. A similar persecution must thwart those who leave the Company of their own accord, tracing and crossing them in every pursuit, by spreading evil reports concerning them, or other calumnious methods. The peculiar business-qualities requisite in members, the methods for attracting the sons of the great and the rich to enter the Company—very similar to those practised in the English College at Rome—these are topics of considerable enlargement. The “reserved cases” next attract attention, with the method of punishment previous

He says :—The most prominent change in the internal constitution of the Society of Jesus, consisted in the advancement of the professed members to the possession of power.

At first the professed members who took the four vows, were but few. Removed from the colleges, and subsisting solely on alms, they had confined themselves to the exercise of spiritual authority. The places which required the active talents of men of the world, such as those of rectors, provincials, and college-offices in general, fell to the lot of the spiritual coadjutors. But this was now altered. The professed members themselves attained to the administration : they had part in the revenues of the colleges, and they became rectors and provincials.¹

to dismissal, and then occurs a curious passage to the effect that all members who have some chance of rising to ecclesiastical dignities must be made to take an oath to have a Jesuit-confessor, and to do nothing without the opinion of the Company. “As Cardinal Tolet failed to observe this rule, the Company procured a decree from the pope enjoining that no descendant of a Jew or Mahometan should be admitted, without making this vow, and however celebrated he might be, he should be expelled as a violent enemy to the Company.” This animus against Tolet certainly accords with that of Parsons and another Jesuit, as we have read. Curious methods for dealing with nuns and devout ladies, certain precautions for enjoying the reputation of holy poverty, are duly developed, and the “mystic whisperings” finish with “the methods for advancing the Company.” These are uniformity of opinion, whether real or pretended, great efforts to shine in knowledge and *good example*—endeavouring to persuade all, high and low, that the Company is absolutely necessary to the Catholic religion, thereby stepping into the houses and places of others (as into the English College), and having gained the favour and authority of princes, the Company will strive to be at least feared by those who do not esteem and love her. Such is the nature of the book. Unquestionably many a Jesuit acted on its principles—and perhaps this was all that the editor of the *Monita* wished to show in these “mystic whisperings.”

¹ In a collection entitled, *Scritture politiche, morali e satiriche sopra le massimi, instituti e governo della Compagna di Gesu*. MS. Rom., there is a circumstantial essay of nearly 400 leaves : “Discorso sopra la religione de’ Padri Gesuiti e loro modo di governare,” written between 1681 and 1686, evidently by a man fully initiated, from which the statements in the text are chiefly derived.

The first result of this was the gradual cooling of that fervent spirit of personal devotion fostered in the isolation of the houses of the professed. Even upon the admission of members, it was no longer possible to look narrowly into their fitness for ascetic vocations. Vitelleschi, Aquaviva's successor, in particular, admitted many who were nowise thus qualified. All strove after the highest station, because it conferred at once spiritual consideration and temporal power. The union of these was in every respect prejudicial. Spiritual coadjutors and the professed members had formerly acted as a check on each other; but now practical importance and spiritual pretensions were united in the same individuals. The shallowest among them had a high conceit of their own abilities, because no one ventured to gainsay them. In possession of exclusive power, they began to enjoy at their ease the wealth which the colleges had acquired in the course of time, and to bend their thoughts only on increasing it: they abandoned to the younger members the real discharge of duty, both in the schools and in the churches.¹ They even assumed a very independent position with regard to the general.

The magnitude of the change is particularly manifested in the character and fortunes of the generals—in the sort of men who were chosen for heads of the Company, and in the manner in which they were dealt with.

How different was Vitelleschi from his absolute, crafty, indomitable predecessor, Aquaviva! Vitelleschi was by nature gentle, indulgent and conciliatory: his acquaintances called him the angel of peace; and on

¹ Discorso. "Molti compariscano, pochi operano: i poveri non si visitano, i terreni non si coltivano * * * Escludendo quei pochi, d'ordinario giovani, che attendono ad insegnare nelle scuole, tutto gli altri, o che sono confessori o procuratori o rettori o ministri, appena hanno occupazione di rilievo."

his death-bed he derived comfort from the assurance that he had never injured any man. These admirable qualities of his amiable disposition were far, however, from sufficing for the government of so widely-diffused, active, and powerful an Order. He was unable to enforce strict discipline in the article of dress, not to speak of his resisting the demands of resolute ambition. It was under his administration, from 1615 to 1645, that the change noticed above took place.¹

In effect, at the death of Aquaviva, discord burst forth anew with redoubled vigour. The Spaniards were eager to restore the generalate to their nation ;—and when they discovered beforehand from the movements of the opposing faction, that Mutio Vitelleschi, a Roman, would obtain the majority of the votes, they solicited the intervention of the French and Spanish ambassadors. The Duke d'Estrées, ambassador of France, refused to interfere, but Ferdinand de Castro was at first inclined to promote their desire. When, however, he became apprised of the machination, he withdrew his support. They clung to their project notwithstanding. They applied to the pope—the same pope, Paul V., whom the English Jesuits scandalised so abominably. Like the heartless, the unscrupulous Parsons, *this* Spanish faction memorialised the pope with bitter complaints against Vitelleschi. Their invectives failed in the issue. The pope said to them : “ If Vitelleschi is such a man as you describe him, rest assured that he will not be elected general : I have, therefore, no business to meddle with this nomination.” Vitelleschi was elected by a majority of only three votes out of seventy-five given in the Congregation.²


¹ Ranke, 307.

² Cretineau, iii. 178.

He was the nominal monarch of 13,000 Jesuits, scattered over every region of the globe—divided into 33 provinces—possessing 550 houses.

Bewildered with success—gasping for more—wild with that impulse which made Napoleon reckless of the future, 'mid the whelming onslaught of his vanguard—his fortune on the point of his bayonet—the Company of Loyola now roamed the universe, like the Lion in his pride and abundance—"in shape and gesture proudly eminent,"—and now no longer "pawing to set free his hinder parts"—"but rampant he shakes his brindled mane."

"Jamque toros multo comit formosior auro,
Signaque Loiolæ pectore fixa gerit.¹



THE BELGIC LION.

¹ Imago, 937.

"Parcite Romani, populares parcite Iberi,
Belgica et ipsa sibi vindicat Ignatium."

BOOK VIII. OR, LE JAY.

How soon did the Jesuits, the clever, polished, “gentlemanly” preachers and teachers of the Company, engross the suffrages of all who, in every age, find an irresistible charm in novelty ! To the bitter annoyance of their predecessors in the sphere of influence, the Jesuits became, or rather, rendered themselves “fashionable,”—indispensable wherever the popedom needed a prop, or such royalty as Philip II. would establish, lacked promoters.

They were recommended by their very name to the devout :—their talents made them respectable to all :—the sworn disinterestedness of their motives, invested them with that conscious power of the man on whom sordid gold makes no impression—excepting that of unmitigated contempt when the heart speaks forth its words of fire.

Years rolled on. The fame of the Company, like the flame of the lamp that illumines the universe, blazed brightly forth—it was the “greater light” to the first children of men, who could not imagine an eclipse of that luminary which shone so intense in its dazzling brightness—so glowingly warm withal.

Cherished by popes, fondled by princes, beloved by their people, it was but natural that the Jesuits should strive to render themselves acceptable men to all who came within the sphere of their influence. Hence the development which they gave to the sciences,—their indefatigable exertions in the education of youth, their future friends and supporters,—their gorgeous Mission-schemes throughout the universe—linking all ranks together by the mesmeric influence of mind and will, which they brought to bear on the consciences—the hopes and fears—the passions, the enjoyments, yea, the vices of mankind, which they alternately schooled or let loose, in their accommodating expedience. This is the philosophical view of the subject :—it may be translated into their motto—*Ad majorem Dei gloriam*, by the Jesuits and their friends : but the undeniable facts which we have read, dissolve that beautiful motto into the disenchanting philosophical view. And yet, not without that admiration which must ever cling to the mind as often as we ponder their deeds of matchless daring, unflinching endurance, unconquerable determination.

What a spirit-stirring epoch of adventurous enthusiasm now dawned for the Jesuits ! It was that epoch so desirable in all human destinies when a position hath been achieved, and conscious energy of heart and mind ratifies the conviction that all may be won, as all hath been vanquished—the memory of struggle stimulating the resolve of achievement. That was the position of the Jesuits at the death of Aquaviva.

One of their missionary voyages most appropriately represents, in metaphor, the coming epoch of the fortunate Company. It was “the last day of July, being according to the Jesuites’ Order and Rome’s appointment,

the day of Ignatius their patron and founder of their religion. The gallant ship, called Santa Gertrudis, wherein were thirty Jesuites—for theirs and their saint's sake made all the rest of the fleet a most gallant show, she being trimmed round about with white linen, her flags and top-gallants representing some of the Jesuites' arms, others the picture of Ignatius himself,—and this from the evening before—shooting off that night at least fifty shot of ordnance, besides four or five hundred squibs—the weather being very calm—and all her masts and tacklings hung with paper lanthorns, having burning lights within them,—the watches ceased not from sounding, nor the Spaniards from singing all night. The day's solemn sport was likewise great—the Jesuites increasing the Spaniards' joy with an open procession in the ship, singing their hymns and anthems to their glorious saint, and all this seconded with roaring ordnance—no powder being spared for the completing of that day's joy and triumph. Thus went on our voyage without any storm, with pleasant gales, many calms, daily sports and pastimes, till we discovered the first land, called *Deseada*.”¹

As a ship on the deep, in her dependance on the winds and tides of popular opinion,—as a rampant lion, in resistless energy,—but as the brilliant jay with its conspicuous wings and imitative faculties, in her countless expedients and surface-decorations, the Company now presents herself to us in that aspect which will be, perhaps, most generally interesting.

After the labour of sixty years, the Jesuit apostolate in India was by themselves acknowledged to be a

¹ Gage, *The English-American, his Travail by Sea and Land*, chap. v.—Of the Indian Fleet that departed from Cales, Ann. Dom. 1625.

failure. The card castles of Xavier fell spontaneously. In the great stronghold of bayonet orthodoxy, there were as many priests, Jesuits, and monks, as there were European soldiers, officials, tradesmen, and merchants: the ceremonies of the Roman faith were performed as magnificently as in the first cathedrals of Europe; the "body of Xavier," that "everlasting miracle and authentic proof of our holy religion," says a Jesuit, "is there always entire; and yet, although there are, in that great city, more than forty or fifty thousand idolaters, scarcely one hundred are baptised in a year—and most of these are orphans torn from their relatives by command of the viceroy. It cannot be said that this results from the want of labourers, or the want of knowledge and enlightenment in the pagans:—many of them listen to the truth, feel it, are persuaded, as they themselves admit; but they would be ashamed to submit to it, as long as it is announced to them by vile organs, polluted, as they think, by a thousand low, ridiculous, abominable customs. The missionaries from Europe were, for a long time, unable to comprehend this strange blindness of the pagans, or, if they understood its cause, they contented themselves with deploring it, without endeavouring to apply a remedy."¹ This announcement was written by a Jesuit missionary in the year 1700, by which period baptismal results furnished a more respectable arithmetical figure in the Annual, the Curious, and Edifying Letters of the Indian Company. On a former occasion I enlarged on the results of the missionary scheme in India, and showed, on Jesuit authority, that little or nothing had really been effected

¹ Lettres Edif. P. Martin au P. Le Gobien, 1^{er} Juin 1700. (Pantheon Lit.) ii, 265.

by Xavier and his successors, except incalculable profanities on the part of the preachers, and great suffering in the miserable pagans. The grand result was, that “the Europeans were deeply despised, and the Christians of the country lived under the opprobrium and burthen of an universal, indestructible anathema.”¹ In fact, “the water of baptism had rarely moistened any but the cheeks that never blushed:” such is the forcible expression of the Jesuit. Xavier and his successors had been baffled; “Christianity” was at a discount; and a new speculation was rendered imperative to the forlorn Jesuits, who were called upon to transmit the edifying baptismal assets to the credit of the Company’s missionary bank. The Portuguese were becoming somewhat remiss in the use of the apostolical musket in aid of the missionary scheme:—but, even left to itself, the Jesuit mind was always competent to invent an expedient:—in the present instance it was very striking.

In 1605, Goa witnessed the disembarkation of an Italian missionary, whose age was twenty-eight. His name was Robert de’ Nobili. He was the scion of a family which had given two popes to the Church, and Cardinal Bellarmine to the Company, besides tracing its descent from the Emperor Otho III. Bellarmine’s nephew, he had joined the Company to the great regret of his mother; who had still more to grieve for her bereavement in beholding his departure for the distant mission. Long had he solicited the apostolate: Aquaviva resisted the pious ambition of the aspirant; but at length yielded to “the inspiration of God,” when the Jesuit’s *family* consented to his departure. This

¹ Cahours, *Des Jesuites*, i. 149, 154.

seasonable deference to the feelings of nature may speak for itself—it looks right well.¹

A glance at the state of the mission at once convinced this Jesuit that the prospect was ruinous: the “deplorable sterility of the Lord’s vineyard” at once suggested that a new mode of culture must be tried. He conceives a grand project; his provincial and brothers give him their approbation; the Archbishop of Cranganor vouchsafes his benediction, and he proceeds to effectuate his pious intention. The attempt had been in vain to propagate Christianity by the lower castes of India: De’ Nobili resolves to operate at once upon the highest; and with this view he resolves to become a Brahmin. *He* would not preach the God of the Pariahs.²

Avoiding all intercourse with Europeans, he put off their dress, discarded their customs, and, penetrating into the interior of the country, dwelt in a hut, after the fashion of the Brahmins. He took care to anticipate detection by the rapidity of his first movement. He chose to himself a servant, poor, but of a noble caste. He carefully learned all the habits and ceremonies in use among persons of quality, in order to copy them with scrupulous exactness. He mastered the *tamul* or vulgar tongue of the country, learned the language of the higher ranks, and the Sanscrit, or the language of science and religion. So rapid was his progress, that in a short time he might be supposed a native of the country—a veritable Saniassi, or penitent Brahmin.³

The Saniassi is the fourth and most perfect institute of the Brahmins. He lays aside the *poita*, or sacrificial cord, composed of 108 threads, in honour of the 108

¹ Juvenci, Hist. Part 5, lib. x, n. 46, *et seq.*; Cahours, i. 148.

² Juvenci, *ut antea*, lib. xviii.; Cahours, i. 158.

³ *Ubi supra*.

faces of the god Brahma ; but continues the usual daily ablutions, in honour of the Linga, with the appointed prayers and ceremonies. The Saniassi must also wear an orange-coloured dress, which, being sacred, is to be washed by no hands but his own. He carries about with him a copper vessel, with a little water in it, for certain appointed ablutions, and for purifying everything offered to him in charity. In his right hand he holds a staff or club, with seven natural knots, others say nine, representing the seven great Rishis, or in honour of the seven planets and the two nodes. This staff, which is greatly valued as a gift of the gods, must be washed every day with water from the Kamadala, or copper vessel ; and by its power, he is preserved from evil spirits. From his shoulders hangs a tiger's skin, on which he sleeps, because thus was Shiva clad. He fasts often ; eats nothing that has life ; flesh, fish, eggs, wine, spirituous liquors, and even certain vegetables are strictly forbidden him. He must bathe in a tank or river three times a-day, going through innumerable ceremonies ; and must rub his forehead and his breast with the ashes of cow's dung,—for the dung of this sacred animal cleanses from sin. He generally suffers his beard to grow, and wears sandals of a particular description, constructed so as to avoid, as much as possible, endangering insect life, and thus, perhaps, dislodging the soul of a progenitor.¹ Having duly passed through this ordeal with the utmost

¹ Bartolom. Systema Bramin. pp. 47, 56, 57 ; Mackay, Calcutta Review, No. 3, "*The Jesuits in India*," a well-written and forceful article. Should this meet the eye of the anonymous friend who sent me the pamphlet, I take the opportunity to express my thanks for the same. It is rarely that one sees, now-a-days, the Jesuit-question treated with knowledge of the subject as in the above-named article. There is, however, an important error in the translation of the passage from the Constitutions (p. 17), where it is made to appear that they

exactitude, under the eyes of his Brahmin servant, De' Nobili went forth with perfect confidence, as the first Brahmin of the Company of Jesus, the Roman Saniassi.



When the Indian Brahmins beheld the impostor, who was dressed exactly like themselves, spoke as well as themselves, resembled them in every feature, from the

require the members to *commit* "mortal sin" in certain circumstances. The meaning of the passage is simply that the Constitutions and rules of the Jesuits do not bind them to compliance in such a manner that they would commit mortal sin by *breaking* them, unless they are expressly enjoined by the superior in the name of Christ and by virtue of holy obedience. The error on the part of the translator is unintentional : it is the *peculiar construction* which has misled him, like others who have stumbled on the 5th chapter of the 6th part of the Constitutions. It requires considerable familiarity with the whole subject, in order to treat of any particular of Jesuitism ; and the same remark applies to

tuft of hair at the top of his shaved head, down to the socks or clogs, in which he moved with ease, despite the goading peg of wood by which they were held to the feet,¹—all were eager to see him. Obscure traditions, but such as ever float on the surface of humanity in all countries, in all ages, were cleverly seized by the Jesuit, now fully and desperately embarked on the wide ocean of mendacity. There was a traditionary belief among the Indians, that there had formerly existed in the land, four ways of truth, of which one had been lost. Nobili affirmed that he was come to point out that last, but most direct spiritual way to immortality.

The critical moment was at hand :—the natural difficulty met the Jesuit—as he had expected. In a large assembly, convened for the purpose, the chief of the Brahmins accused him publicly as an impostor, who sought to deceive the people by lies, in order to introduce a new religion into the country. But the Jesuit was prepared for the assault :—he produced a written scroll, by way of testimonial, of course a forgery, produced witnesses suborned to abet the imposture, and, finally, *he made oath that he was from an illustrious caste*—by

the whole system of Roman Catholicism, though many seem to think otherwise, and seldom write a page without many blunders, which the youngest controversialist of Rome can easily demolish.

¹ The Jesuit Saniassis found this clog one of the greatest trials on the mission. Father Bouchet says :—“ These clogs are at first insupportable, and it is with the greatest difficulty that we can get used to them. I have seen many missionaries whose toes were excoriated, and the wound which was enlarged considerably, lasted four or five months ; as for myself, I have had a similar wound during six months continually. Hence one of our missionaries said that the language of the country, however difficult it be, cost him less to get used to it, and that he more easily learnt to speak than to walk.”—*Lett. Edif. Mem. des Indes*. The noble castes of India cannot touch leather without being defiled and degraded : only the Pariahs use leather.—*Perrin, Voyage*, i. 254 ; *Cahours*, i. 160.

equivocation, *meaning his Italian descent*, but wishing the Indians to believe that he had verily sprung from the god Brahma. The roguery was quite successful. Three Brahmins, overpowered by such strong evidence, then rose, and persuaded their brethren not to persecute a man who called himself a Brahmin, and proved that he was a Brahmin by written evidence, and solemn oaths, as well as by conformity to their manners, conduct, and dress. This interposition, by whatever means it was procured, decided the question, and the impostor, being juridically recognised as a Brahmin, received, or rather announced his name as Tatouva Podagar Souami, which means being interpreted, "the man who has passed master in the twenty-five or ninety-six qualifications proper for the true sage."¹

And now the cheat was to be kept up ; the pious equivocation was to be practically continued ; the "right intentioned" imposture was to be a "standing miracle" of exertion ; the deliberate falsehood was to fructify unto the salvation of souls, and baptisms by the thousand and the million. In truth it was a clever speculation on that love of novelty in the human breast ;—and incredible as the perfection of the imposture appears, still, we may concede the vain boast to the Jesuits, since the more this impostor imitated the pagan ceremonial, and the customs of the Brahmins, the less would the pagans have "to do, in order to be saved," with a teacher, whom they necessarily believed to be exactly as themselves—with only a speculative doctrine to super-add to their own philosophy and theology.

"The town of Madura was roused ; visitors thronged

¹ Mackay, *ut antea* ; Juvenci, *ubi suprâ* ; Cahours, i. 160. "Il produisit des témoins et jura qu'il sortait d'une caste illustre." Ranke, 253.

from all parts. Nobili kept them at a distance—admitting only certain persons, and at certain hours, in order to entice attention and curiosity. For, in the opinion of the Indians, especially, the more a thing is rare and difficult to find, the more precious it is : gold, they say, and pearls are hidden—labour is indispensable for their discovery. Nobili's science, his manners, and penitential life, attracted a great number of disciples. He opened a school ; mixed evangelical lessons with scientific information ; and, in a short time the doctrine of the European *gourou* was reputed noble, and worthy of the Indians. In order to *ingraft* Christianity—*pour enter le Christianisme*—on those natures till then rebellious, he availed himself of everything—attacking them on all sides where he could find an entrance, by the aid of appeals to reason, their prejudices, their national traditions.”¹

The ancient tradition before-named was his fulcrum : —“ the apostle told them that the fourth way of salvation was discovered—that he was come to announce to them that sublime and blessed law which was the object of their wishes. He was believed : ”—seventy Brahmins “ bowed before the cross,” such is the usual metaphor,—“ and were, in a short time, *baptised*,” which was the real result, and nothing more. By that ceremonial they acknowledged themselves the disciples of *Tatouva Podagar Souami*. If he “ developed the laws of the Gospel and its mysteries,” as we are told,² it is evident that he must have cloaked them in such a manner, he must have disfigured them to such an extent, that the Brahmins could no longer discern the

¹ Juvenci, *ut antea*, as quoted by the modern Jesuit, Cahours, i. 160, 161.

² Cahours, i. 160, *et seq.* ; Juvenci, *ut antea*, n. 50, *et seq.*

"abomination,"—in fact, to use the Jesuit's phrase, they could not say that he was preaching to them "the God of the Pariahs."¹

This was not the only inconvenience attending this extraordinary speculation. There happened to be a nest of Franciscan monks in Madura. Now, the people, charmed with the appearance of the new Brahmin who came no one knew whence, looked down with contempt on the poor Franciscans, whose dress and common manner of life were not calculated to cope with the extraordinary pretensions of the new Saniassi, and made no appeal to their national vanity and superstition. For many years these monks had a church in Madura, where they performed the functions of their ministry. They were labouring comfortably, if not successfully, in that "vineyard of the Lord," when the intrusion of the Jesuit forced them to decamp, and yield the field to the new comer, who considerably surpassed them in the art of accommodating himself to the taste of the Indians. Freed from these importunate witnesses, the Jesuit gave full swing to his ambitious zeal, and, for once at least, exposed the Catholic religion to a just accusation of being idolatrous.² Thus the conduct or the success of

¹ "Il ne faut pas qu'ils puissent dire : il vient encore nous prêcher le Dieu des Pariahs."—*Cahours*, 158, quoting *Juvenci*, Part 5, lib. xviii. 47, 48. The modern Jesuit, Cahours, Michelet's opponent, tells us that "it appears that the King of Madura himself yielded to the evidence of a religion now become noble in his estimation," and was cut to pieces by the Brahmins to prevent the scandal. And on whose authority is this fact alleged? That of a *modern* Jesuit who wrote in 1840! In effect, if these Brahmins actually acknowledged the teacher as one of themselves, sanctioned his name as an orthodox credential, how could they cut their king to pieces for becoming his disciple? An inattentive reader would slur the authority given by Cahours for this "fact," and the Jesuits generally count on such inadvertence in their statements.—See *Cahours*, i. 162, note 2, where he states his authority as above, trusting that the reader would not stop to ask how a Jesuit could attest such a fact 240 years after its occurrence?

² Platel, Mem. Hist. i. 13.

Nobili naturally excited a clamour in the rivals of the Jesuits,—or in those who objected to the specious Christianity thus inculcated.

The rumour of these innovations reached Goa. The missionaries of different Orders, and all the clergy, sent complaints to the Holy See, and the Roman Saniassi was summoned to Goa. This was in 1618: he had “pursued the course of his apostolical triumphs, encouraged by the approval of his superiors, during the space of thirteen years.”¹

At Goa the Jesuit met with a bad reception. He came just as he was, by the necessity of his position, which he could not resign more easily than he had assumed it: “all were irritated at his scandalous conduct. He had given out that he was born of the head of Brahma—since he had incorporated himself with the haughty caste of a like origin. When he appeared with his cylindrical cap of flame-coloured silk, covered with a long scarf that fell like a shawl over his shoulders, with his red muslin robe, his large ear-buckles, and his forehead distinguished by a broad *potou*, or yellow mark, made with the paste of the sandanum-wood,—his superior, Father Palmerio, the visitor of India, would not deign to look at him; and all his Jesuit-brethren exclaimed, that they ought to eject from the mission a man who gave himself to idolaters, instead of gaining them to Jesus Christ. Four things particularly shocked them: his name, the mark on his brow, his continual ablutions, and the string composed of a hundred and eight yellow threads, which he permitted his disciples to wear.” It is difficult to reconcile this “shock” of

¹ “Rassuré par l’approbation de ses supérieurs et par treize années d’expérience,” &c.—*Cahours*, i. 163; *Cordara*, Hist. S. J., P. 6, p. 165—169.

the Jesuits with the fact asserted by the same pen, that Nobili had started with the approval of his scheme at head quarters, and had been encouraged by the same approval for thirteen years in his apostolical triumphs. However, as we are told, Nobili defended his conduct so successfully, that "every one of his brethren sided with him," and yet the sum of his defence was a mere assertion that all he adopted was the sign of nobility and not of superstition. The archbishop of Goa was of a different opinion. Was it proper, he asked, to become a Brahmin in order to make Christians? Was it not sufficient to explain the doctrine of a religion sufficiently eloquent of itself? If the Indians rejected it, after having it explained to them in the usual way, it was their fault: the preachers had only to wash their hands of the matter. Unquestionably there was sound sense in this argument. The Jesuit historian is of a different opinion: he says, "it was not difficult to reply to it:" but he does not state the replication.¹

Meanwhile the affair had been discussed at Rome. Cardinal Bellarmine at once condemned the conduct of his nephew. "I will not enter into the discussion of each article: but to imitate the Brahmins, and observe certain rites, is a practice diametrically opposed to the humility of Jesus Christ, very dangerous to the faith, and this I cannot pass over in silence. It were better," said he, "that the Brahmins should not be converted to the faith, than that Christians should not preach the gospel freely and sincerely."²

¹ Cahours, i. 163, *et seq.*

² "Minus quidem est ut Brachmani non convertantur ad fidem, quam ut Christiani non liberè et sincerè Evangelium prædicent."—*Apud Platel*, i. 15. Cahours says that Bellarmine wrote his nephew "a letter full of reproaches," i. 165. It appears that Bellarmine seemed, subsequently, to alter his opinion,

Nobili pursued his scheme notwithstanding, and his brethren followed his example. Moreover, they undertook to justify the method and its practices. They sent memorials to the pope, adroitly disguising the affair, and soliciting Gregory XV. to impose silence on all who condemned the rites they permitted their "converts" to practise. Counter memorials succeeded; and the pope issued a mandate which the Jesuit historians falsely represent as "authorising the conduct of the Jesuit-Brahmin, until the Holy See should further examine the affair."¹ The Jesuits, who at first pretended to be so "shocked," but soon aware of their danger, boldly asserted that the rites were merely civil observances, and had nothing in them of a religious nature; that they were neither contrary to the faith nor to morality, and, moreover, that they were absolutely essential to the propagation of Christianity in India.² Misled by such representations, yet doubtful of their good faith, Pope Gregory XV., in the year 1623, issued the mandate

and the Jesuits, of course, took the credit of a change, or an apparent change, necessitated by his connection with the Order, and their determination to continue the practices.

¹ "Mais un inquisiteur de Goa, Almeida, plaïda sa cause, et le 31 Janvier, 1623, Gregoire XV. autorisa la conduite du Jesuite-brahme, jusqu' à ce que le Saint-Siège examinât de nouveau l'affaire."—*Cahours*, i. 165; *Cordara, ut antea*, p. 310—312.

² It is difficult to reconcile the character thus given by the Jesuits to the practices in question, with their words elsewhere; for Juvenci expressly says that Nobili "made himself acquainted with all the institute and ceremonies of the Brahmins;" and that his imitation of the same was complete, must be evident from the fact, that he deceived the Brahmins themselves. Here is the passage recording the Jesuit-wonder:—"Brachmanum instituta omnia cœremoniasque cognoscit; linguam vernaculam dictam vulgò Tamulicam, quæ latissimè pertinet, addiscit; addit Badagicam, qui principum et aulæ sermo, denique Grandonicam sive Samuteradam, quæ lingua eruditorum est, cæterum tot obsita difficultatibus, nulli ut Europæo bene cognita fuisset ad eam diem atque inter ipsosmet Indos plurimum scire videantur qui hanc utcunq; norint etsi aliud nihil norint."—*Juvenc. Hist. S. J.*, P. 5, t. ii. lib. xviii. § ix. n. 49.

before mentioned, wherein he allows the wearing of the cord—*provided* it be merely a mark of nobility ; the use of sandal-wood—*provided* it be rubbed on the body merely as an ornament, or on account of its flavour ; and the practice of bathing, *but only* for the purpose of cleanliness and refreshment : on the other hand, he condemns in the strongest language, and beseeches them, by the bowels of Christ, to abstain from every rite or practice attended with the slightest offence, or defiled by the smallest possible tincture of superstition—*à quâlibet vel levissimâ culpâ aut maculâ, necdum ab impurissimâ superstitionis labe*. He also ordains that there should be no distinction in the Church, between the Pariahs, and the higher castes, but that all should hear the word of God, and partake of the sacred mysteries *together*.¹ These reserves and exceptions were, of course, a virtual prohibition of the scheme. To the present hour these practices exist among the Hindoos, and they are essentially “outward signs of inward grace”—veritable “religious” ceremonials to all intents and purposes. Now, the Jesuits had not foreseen that these reserves and exceptions would be contained in the papal document, and when they discovered the fact, the document was suppressed, and they continued their practices,—nor was it until 1680 that its existence was made known to the monks—during which interval of fifty-seven years, they constantly protested to the Capuchins that the Holy See had permitted the separation of the castes in the churches.² It was in order to avoid public scandal, and probably in deference to the mighty Order, that this papal admonition was sent to the Jesuits

¹ Mackay's analysis of the Document, which is given entire in Platel's *Mémoires Hist.* i. 22.

² Platel, i. 51.

alone. Certainly, it only concerned the Company ; and the Jesuits, with their usual tact, wisely resolved to put it under the bushel where they had placed the lamp of the faith—as far as the Hindoos were concerned, for the sake of Brahma, Shiva, and Vishnu, and the arithmetical annual letters of “conversion.” The speculation was prosecuted with unabated vigour—“until further provision should be made by the Holy See.” Such was the beginning of the famous *Malabar rites* which were subsequently to give some trouble to the Church or its various parties.

The Company was equally successful in China, after years of incalculable toil, and admirable perseverance. Xavier died in sight of China, the object of his burning zeal : abler men were to achieve the conquest for the Company. After various abortive attempts by other Jesuits, Fathers Ricci and Valignani effected an entrance into the Celestial Empire in 1583.

This mighty empire was certainly a fine attraction for the enterprising Company. Of immense extent, unbounded wealth, enjoying a degree of prosperity and comfort far above any other region of the universe at that time, all that it seemed to need—in the estimation of the Jesuits—was a foundation of the Company to stir the stagnant pond of their unchangeable virtues and vices. The Chinese enjoyed that enviable condition when humanity, individually or collectively, is perfectly satisfied with itself, in every possible item of bodily and mental necessities. They believed themselves the only nation worth naming in the universe. They believed they had reached the utmost perfection of the arts and sciences. They thought their government the most perfect that could be established. By the way, it may

be observed that although the emperor was possessed of unlimited power, he carried on his government by means of literary officers, called mandarins, divided into nine classes, and to the number of thirteen thousand, six hundred and forty-seven. All these were doctors—so that China might be said to be governed by philosophers. Here then is a despotic government patronising, promoting, nay, insisting on education for the million—without running any risk whatever of finding knowledge operating unto insubordination, and all the horrors which have been so long an excuse for the ignorance of the masses in the west of the church-ridden hemisphere. Every career was open to ambition. A certain amount of education made a mandarin, and a mandarin was an officer, and an officer was a well-paid “public functionary.” The emperor received a revenue of one hundred and fifty millions of gold ; and yet there was an ample remnant for the three thousand six hundred and forty-seven mandarins, raised by the glorious prerogative of mind, from among two hundred and fifty millions of Chinamen, each and all of whom were competent, by the glorious prerogative aforesaid, “to gain dominion, or to keep it gain’d.”

Like all other nations, ambition, avarice, mistrust, and voluptuousness compounded their nature ; and if they excluded all foreigners with too much rigour, this peculiarity resulted from precisely the same spirit of exclusiveness which we behold everywhere, on a smaller scale, in all the departments of society. Exclusiveness and monopoly are amongst the most natural instincts of man.

The Chinese had attained great skill in diplomacy, were admirable and prosperous traders, very skilful in

the mechanical arts, as far as they went and wished to go,¹—for another peculiarity of the Chinese was *statu-quo-ism*, their imitative faculties having from time immemorial completely palsied the inventive. They were satisfied with their country; they were contented with their trades, arts, and sciences; they were, of course, enamoured with their system of government, in which every man might share; and though their religion inflicted some roguish taxes upon them in the shape of “offerings,” yet their priests did not meddle with their private concerns, but kept within their comfortable temples:—and so they were inclined for maintaining a *statu-quo-ism* in their religion as well; which, for the most part, was a sort of idolatry, managed by a million of priests called Bonzas, more than half of whom were

¹ The Chinese were the inventors of the art of printing, the composition of gunpowder, and the magnetic compass. To these must be added the very remarkable manufactures of silk and porcelain. The former inventions were disputed to the Chinese in the last century: but their claim seems to be now generally admitted. Undoubtedly they would excel in all the arts, if the “public taste” directed their efforts, or their desires were taught to expatiate as in our restless corner of the universe. Nor must their primitive Junk, *qui vidit mare turbidum*, which has entered the Thames, all the way from China, give a despicable notion of the Chinamen’s constructiveness. Think of the horrible wars, as well as the world-encircling commerce, which have perfected the naval constructiveness of Europeans. The Chinese may be called cowards for their strong inclination to peace (which would be the best proof of *our* religion and enlightenment) but perhaps their *statu-quo-ism* in ship-building results from the absence of national restlessness and enterprise, originating in that lack “of oak and triple brass” which we have hammered into our ships, but which Horace supposed to be “about the breast of the man”

“—— qui fragilem truci
Commisit pelago ratem
Primus ——”

“Who first to the deep so cruel,
Gave his bark
Or his ark
Unfit to swim on gruel.”

generously pensioned by the emperor—another admirable feature of the Chinese, tending to secure their religion from that love of innovation most commonly suggested by an expensive ecclesiastical establishment. As in Japan and India, there were numerous pagan monks, hermits, and penitents; some of them were provided with revenues, others were mendicants. Unprovided with the machinery of the Roman monkhood, these pagan cœnobites only served to keep up that charity of the human breast which can never take flight from amongst men, without leaving an “aching void” behind—the instinct of patronage, common to the lowest and the highest of men.

I said that the Chinese were, for the most part, idolaters; but they were not very reasonable in their notions. If their prayers to their idols were successful, they gave them honour and offerings; but if they failed to obtain their desires, they treated them with abuse and blows—just as the Portuguese and Spaniards treated the images of their saints on similar occasions. Man’s notion of his God is invariably proportioned to his mental organisation and its enlightenment.

In China, a man who raised himself to honours, ennobled his ancestors as well,—there being no hereditary honours to compensate for those virtues or qualifications which are underground; but the Chinese, nevertheless, paid to their ancestors a veneration almost amounting to idolatry. They celebrated annually, with extraordinary rites and ceremonies, the memory of their departed parents, to stimulate filial respect in the living, as well as to honour the dead.

The memory of their great teacher Fohi, or Confucius, had a temple raised to it; and at each new and

full moon, all the magistrates fell down and bowed the knee before the venerable master, who had taught the religion of the country. Believing in one supreme God, whom they called the King of Heaven, they had a variety of idols, subject to the former—presiding spirits of the mountains, rivers, and the world's four quarters—all symbols in the abstract, but gods in the concrete. Nothing could exceed the imposing figure of their goddess Cybele, or Isis, whom they commonly called Pussa, or Puss.

Of course the Chinamen were exceedingly superstitious. Indeed, the Jesuit Trigautius prefaces his account of their superstitions with an admonition to the reader not to scoff at the Chinese on this account, or to despair of their cure, remembering how long they have been involved in the darkness of Paganism:—he had much better have repeated the proverb about people who live in houses of glass—or the beam and the mote. For, he records that the Chinese observed lucky and unlucky days, annually noted by the royal astrologers: their houses were filled with these almanacs, which had an enormous circulation—just like similar productions in England, at the present day. Astrologers, and every sort of soothsayers, met with encouragement, whether they read the future in the hands, or the face, by dreams, chance words in conversation, and numberless other devices:—many live by the same trade in England, at the present time. Some elicited oracles from devils, by the mouths of infants and brute beasts:—unquestionably, numerous examples of similar superstitions existed at the very time in Catholic Christendom. The Chinese had a superstition as to the position of their doors and windows—and decidedly many of us are very particular

as to the position of our beds—and 'tis a bold stomach that will sit down and make a thirteenth guest at a dinner-party.¹ All China was full of impostors of all kinds, says the Jesuit—and so was the Christendom whence the Company went to evangelise them. In certain provinces, infanticide was common :—but the Chinese had an excuse in their belief in the transmigration of souls—supposing that they sent the souls of their children from a lot of pinching want to abundance. Suicide was also not unusual—as everywhere else in all ages and all countries.

There were only three religious sects in all China with her 250 millions of living souls:—that of Fohi, a pure Deism without idols—inculcating that the punishment of vice, and the reward of virtue, are applied in this world, either directly on the delinquent, or indirectly on his posterity, according to their deserts. Fohi taught the immortality of the soul, and an hereafter of rewards and penalties, in addition to those in the present life ;—but subsequent teachers taught final annihilation ; whilst others supposed that only the souls of the good endured after death, whilst those of the wicked, on leaving the body, vanished away, as it were converted into smoke.

The second sect taught doctrines very similar to those of the Christians,—as though they had received a certain shade from our philosophers, and even from the Gospel light, says the Jesuit. They taught a trinity—a heaven—a hell. They extolled celibacy, and repudiated marriage. They made pilgrimages. They had a

¹ This last superstition originated in the statistical fact, that of any thirteen persons, the probability is that one will die in the course of the year following the observation ; but this depends on the law of mortality, and not on the meeting at dinner.

chant perfectly similar to the Gregorian. They placed images in their temples. Their priests wore vestments exactly like those of the Roman clergy. They forbade the use of flesh-meat and all that has had life ; but “dispensations” on this score might be obtained for money ; and the same dispensations were applicable to all other sins—yea, even from the torments of the other world, these priests promised to liberate souls, “for a consideration.” The priests were unscrupulous rogues, and given to all manner of vices.

The third sect seems to have been a sort of exorcists, whose peculiar function was to drive the devil from houses, by means of monstrous figures drawn on paper, and stuck upon the walls—nothing to be wondered at in China, if very similar pretensions and practices existed, yea exist, in Christendom.¹

Such is a brief view of the new vineyard which the Company is now resolved to cultivate. “O rock, O rock ! when wilt thou open ?” exclaimed the Jesuit Valignani, at his previous abortive attempts to “set on fire” the Celestial Empire.

Valignani, a celebrated missionary, styled the Apostle of the Orient, selected workmen adapted to the enterprise. He set them to the language, in the first place. This was a formidable task in those days—at least, according to the Jesuits. Each word, said Trigautius, has its hieroglyphical character ; and there are as many letters as there are words—that is, from seventy-two to eighty thousand. Ten thousand were enough for common purposes.² But the mastery which has been

¹ For all these Chinese curiosities more *in extenso*, see Moreri, iii. ; Quesnel, ii. ; Trigautius, *De Christianâ Expeditione apud Sinus*, lib. i. ; Kircher, *China Illustrata*, P. iii.

² Trigaut. l. i. c. 5.

obtained of the Chinese language by several Europeans, among whom Englishmen hold a conspicuous place, seems to prove that the rumoured difficulties of its acquisition, from the alleged number and variety of the characters, are the mere exaggerations of ignorance.¹ But the Jesuits never described any exploit of their men without making "the most of it." Besides, this terrible language was enough of itself, as represented, to "throw cold water" on the zeal of their rivals in the vineyard of the Lord.

In effect, these Jesuits soon mastered the language sufficiently to make the attempt: but their stay at Macao was short,—for, although they managed to remove somewhat of the bad impression inspired by all foreigners—still the Chinese not only despised, but suspected them of sinister designs upon their country. Ricci did not remain idle. He found the means for buying a piece of land, built a house, furnished it comfortably for himself and two companions, and had wherewithal to fee the mandarins and other officers

¹ The roots, or original characters of the Chinese, are only 214 in number, and might be reduced to a much smaller amount by a little dissection and analysis. These are combined with each other to form other words, or express other ideas, very much in the same way that the individual Arabic numerals in common use are combined to express the infinite series of numbers. By a species of analogy, they may be called the alphabet of language, with the difference that exists between an alphabet of ideas, and an alphabet of sounds. To assert that there are so many thousand characters in the Chinese, is much the same thing as to say that there are so many thousand words in Johnson's Dictionary; nor is a knowledge of the whole at all more necessary for every practical purpose, than it is to get all Johnson's Dictionary by heart, in order to read English. Prémare, a Jesuit, observes, "that any one might read and write Chinese after he has once acquired a good knowledge of 4000 or 5000 characters or words," which is about the qualification requisite for the same result in any other language, though, of course, allowance must be made for the absence of analogy in the Chinese to the languages of Europe.—See *Knight's Cyclopædia*, vii. 82.

whose protection he had to purchase. Then he set about studying the manners and character of his new neighbours, and digested his plans accordingly for their instruction and enlightenment.

The difficulties of the undertaking were enhanced by the encroachments of the Portuguese and Spaniards, in various directions near the coast of China. These conquests of the ravenous Europeans were certainly sufficient to render the Chinese diffident of foreigners : and the repeated attempts of the Jesuits were not calculated to quiet their alarms. Aware of these facts, these Jesuits were exceedingly circumspect in their conduct and intercourse with the natives. At first they contented themselves with enticing them to their house by the exhibition of well-painted pictures in their chapel—first-rate curiosities to the Chinamen, who had never before seen any thing of the sort.¹

Ricci had been a pupil of the celebrated Jesuit mathematician Clavius. He excelled in the science and all the mechanical arts connected with it ;—and he was to turn the same to the account of the exhibition, which he did with admirable tact, energy, and success. His fame walked the land, and sped to curious ears and understandings, and a posse of mandarins flocked to Father Ricci, to inspect a multitude of mathematical instruments which he was constructing with his own hands, and with the aid of some native workmen. Astrolabes, quadrants, armillary spheres, globes, celestial and terrestrial—amazed and delighted the learned officials—“great things and full of wonder in their eyes.” Astronomy and astrology being such important prophets to the whole Celestial Empire, the Jesuit was

¹ Lett. Edif. Mis. de la Chine, Preface.

evidently in the royal road to favour by so adroitly "suited the taste of the public." Ricci gave them lectures on the rotundity of the earth, which they thought a plane. He described "the starry sphere," the revolutions of the planets, the cause of eclipses and the phases of the moon, according to the "hypothesis" of the unfortunate Galileo, then proscribed at Rome, and totally unsuspected in China. Vast were their admiration and delight. Ricci they considered the first mathematician in the world, "and no wonder that they did," says Bartoli sily, "for they knew nothing of our world." "But what, above all, gave fine play and advancement to the faith," continues Bartoli, "was a map of the world." There was a slight mistake in it, however. China appeared only as a small part of the universe, whilst these good people flattered themselves that China was the universe, with a small border of land towards the north, tenanted by the barbarians, as they knew to their cost in many an invasion, and as they figured it in their map of universal China. This was a blunder on the part of the Jesuit. In vain he tried to do away with the humiliating impression by a glowing description of the mighty kingdoms which shoved the Celestial Empire "into a lower world obscure"—

"The realm of Bocchus to the Black-moor sea,
From Gallia, Gades, and the British west ;
Germans and Seythians, and Sarmatians, north
Beyond Danubius, to the Tauric pool."

All in vain ! Matteo Ricci had "insulted them in a manner which their honour could not brook." The Jesuit's invention came to the rescue. He set to work once more with his instruments, and constructed another map of the world, on a new "projection"—placing

China exactly in the centre ! It was a glorious idea ; and gave inexpressible satisfaction. Numerous copies were made and winged all over the Celestial Empire, “ and with them went forth the knowledge of our world, and the fame of the strangers who had described it, with the art of a master hand ; and great was the desire of the literati of every province to see such men, to admire them as monsters of genius, instead of detesting them as monsters of nature, merely because they were strangers.”¹ Still more to enhance his recommendations, Ricci committed to memory striking passages from the writings of their great teacher, Fohi, or Confucius;² and confined his first professional inculcations to the morality of religion :—his companions followed the same judicious method.³

The entertainment thus furnished to the Chinese *literati*, who crowded to the residence of the fathers, was duly appreciated by the audience. Induced by this first success, Ricci thought he might advance to the dogmas of the faith, and composed a catechism, to which he gave universal circulation :—but it proved a failure ; if it procured him applause, it did not advance the main object in view—conversion. Meanwhile the lower orders of Chinamen insulted and otherwise maltreated the fathers on every occasion ;—it was a curious and striking fact, that the patronage lavished upon these strangers by the great, had the effect of exasperating, instead of conciliating, the vulgar herd of China, as was expected. Truly the Chinese are, in most of their notions, diametrically opposed to our Europeans. Half that patronage in Europe would

¹ Bartoli, *Della Cina*, f. 188—192.

² Ranke, 254 ; Juvenci, lib. xix.

³ Lett. Edif. *ut anteà*.

have ensured to the strangers a thousand acclamations, instead of insult on every occasion. The result was, in other respects, unfortunate ;—for the slow progress of the mission was attributed to the political caution of the Jesuits, and already was their conduct bitterly denounced by their rivals in Europe.¹

Nevertheless, Ricci was advancing. In the face of the general barrenness of the mission, he multiplied the residences and his missionaries : they laboured : but in vain—they were forced to decamp ; and the veteran remained single-handed to battle with the many-handed *Pussa* of China.² But the prejudices and avidity of the people and the mandarins worried him incessantly : he was forced to fall back on Macao.³

Once more to the field went the unflinching Matteo Ricci. He tried another vineyard, a city rejoicing in the name of Chao-Cheu, and set up as teacher of mathematics. A gleam of success cheered his efforts. Under the shade of his lines and angles, his “impossible roots” and *trap-ezi-hed-rons*, a few Chinamen went asleep, and awoke converted. Others followed their example. Still the rabble continued to maltreat the father ; and he resolved to avail himself of his high reputation among the literati, to gain admission into the presence of his imperial majesty himself, hoping that, could he succeed in rendering the emperor favourable to his religion, it would make more certain and rapid progress. In accordance with this grand design, he threw off the dress of a bonza, which he had hitherto worn,

¹ Lett. Edif. Mis. de la Chine, Preface.

² See her portrait in Kircher, *China Illustrata*, p. 141. She has eighteen hands, seventeen of which are presenting each an emblem : but the eighteenth is empty, as it were, waiting to be filled by the Jesuits, for it is the right hand nearest her *head*.

³ Lett. Edif. *ut antea*.

but which was as despicable to the Chinamen as the habiliments of the monks to similar Europeans ; and he donned the vestments of the literati, which were held in high estimation. He had won the friendship of a great mandarin : this personage was just starting for the court ; and Ricci asked the favour to travel in his company to the same destination. He consented : they set out : but the mandarin changed his mind on the road—leaving Ricci to his wits at Nankin. The Jesuit fructified his disappointment—one of the best fruit-trees in our earthly pilgrimage, if we resolve to make it bear. Ricci made his way to the viceroy of Nankin, who gave him a flattering reception ; and he soon found himself in his element—pouring forth the treasures of his brain to a club of mandarins and literati. He composed works of science and morality, which met with the usual success ; and the viceroy proposed that he should remain in Nankin, and a residence forthwith arose in the populous city. Again he tried to gain access to the emperor, and in a similar manner ; but again was he disappointed—but this time he actually reached Pekin, the Pisgah of his hope, faith, and charity. In his disappointment he amused himself with topographical observations, and discovered, by what seemed to him evident arguments, that Pekin was the Cambalao of the famous traveller, Paul of Venice, and that China was the kingdom of Cathay.¹

Unable to effect his main purpose, Ricci returned

¹ Lett. Edif. *ut antea*. Ricci said that the fire-works he saw at Pekin were superior to any in any other part of the world. The Jesuit, D'Incarville, afterwards sent the prescription for their composition to France. What seems to have struck the Jesuit with the greatest admiration, was a Chinese observatory built on the summit of a high mountain. There was a large court surrounded with large enclosures, and full of instruments, amongst which Ricci mentioned four very curious ones, which, although they had been exposed to the air for about 250 years, had lost nothing of their polish and lustre.—*Ibid*.

to Nankin, and vigorously cultivated his first success. He won to himself numerous disciples, and built a church. In his growing prosperity, he resolved once more to attempt the emperor ; but without “patronage :” the cold-hearted smiler had deceived him twice : he would now stand on his own legs in the imperial presence. For this result, he prepared valuable presents for the emperor, and got together all the European curiosities, which he had all along been collecting for the purpose. He set out with his head, and his heart, and his curiosities ; and, after numberless difficulties and contradictions, he reached the capital, and penetrated to the emperor, who graciously received his presents, consisting of a clock, a watch that struck the hours, a picture of Christ, and one of the Virgin Mary, with other valuable trifles. The Jesuit made so favourable an impression on the emperor, that he was permitted to establish himself at Peking, with the privilege for himself and his companions to enter the enclosure of the palace four times a year :—in a word, success at last crowned his efforts, after as hard a battle as was ever fought by head and heart against resistance of every possible kind, for the space of twenty years to the moment when, with his clocks, and watches, and his *brains*, he captivated the good-will of imperial majesty.¹ Consider this career, ye who seem to think that difficulty is a proper excuse for idleness of hand or brain. And those who professionally abuse and denounce the Company of the Jesuits, should select a few of these samples which she has given to the world ; and, having duly considered all things, decide whether they have any right whatever to abuse and denounce the Jesuits.

¹ Lett. Edif. *ut antea*.

The smiles of royalty changed the whole aspect of the missionary scheme. Imperial favour rendered the unquestionable qualifications of the Jesuits irresistible. Those who were ready to join the clever and fascinating strangers, but held off for fear of imperial displeasure, now openly announced themselves disciples. How the Jesuits managed to “do away with” the natural and national obstacles to the profession of the Christian faith, is not at present the question. Progress, expansion, was the watchword. Ricci had given the emperor one of his maps, with China in the middle : the emperor ordered ten more to be executed on silk for the imperial apartments ; whilst the whole empire was opened to the mission, with the Jesuits in the centre, radiating far and wide on all sides, winning proselytes, whom they transformed into apostles to carry out the scheme indefinitely expanding. Converts followed converts,—a boundless prospect of success opened before the mission ; and whilst Ricci was advancing in imperial favour, the fame of his successful enterprise was eliciting great exultation at Rome. Pope Sixtus V. granted a jubilee to the Company, which he complimented on the occasion ; and Aquaviva dispatched fresh labourers to the vineyard,—men able to copy the example of the first labourers—so clever, determined, indefatigable—beginning with mathematics and geography, and ending with religion and theology. Wonderful “Connexion of the Sciences !” In the map which he made for the emperor, Ricci filled the vacant spaces with Christian texts and emblems. His scientific talents procured respect for his religious instruction. Not only were his immediate pupils gained over, but many mandarins, whose garb he now assumed, became the disciples of the learned

Jesuit. A Sodality of the Virgin Mary was formed at Pekin in 1605. The emperor retained Ricci constantly at court; and his presence near the throne was a safeguard to his companions throughout the empire. He died in 1610, worn out, not only by excessive labour, but chiefly by the numerous visits, the long dinners, and all the other exertions of Chinese social etiquette—an unworthy termination to a career of such admirable energy, tenacity of purpose, and patient endurance, as some will exclaim, superadding, “*If his cause had been that of truth!*”—but if we ask them, *What is Truth?* we shall have much less reason than Pilate had to wait for the answer. Ricci’s motto and advice had always been “to go to work without parade and noise, and, in such stormy seas, to keep close to the shore:”—his successors followed his advice as far as science was concerned.¹

An eclipse of the moon occurred in 1610. The predictions of the native astronomers and of the Jesuits, differed from each other by a whole hour:—the event proved that the Jesuits were right, and, of course, added greatly to their credit. Together with some mandarins, their pupils, they were charged with the reform of the astronomical tables, so necessary for the astrological almanacs of the Chinese: they performed the task to admiration, and their success promoted the cause of Christianity or the mission. In 1611 there were Christian congregations in five provinces of the empire. In the opposition which the Jesuits encountered, nothing was of so much service to them as the fact that their pupils had written books which met

¹ Lett. Edif. *ut antea*; Ranke and Juvenci, *ut antea*; Historica Relatio de Ortu, &c. Fidei, &c. in Regno Chin. p. 4; Bartoli, f. 194.

with the approbation of the learned. They had the art to elude the storms which threatened them : they complied, as closely as possible, with the usages of the country, and this they were empowered to do, in several points, by the pope, in 1619.¹

But the Jesuits relate other inexplicable successes, which enhanced their reputation. A single sample must suffice. A certain mandarin built a house, which was no sooner finished, than a troop of devils took possession, and raised a tempest within, appearing in the most horrible forms that could possibly be imagined. The pagan exorcists, before described, tried their method to no purpose whatever. The house remained incurable and was exhibited as one of the marvels of the city. Thereupon the owner offered the building at a cheap purchase to Father Ricci, since no one else would have it as a gift—"for," said the Chinaman to the Jesuit, "you are a holy man, and I fancy that the devils will not be able to hurt you." Ricci bowed to the opinion which he confirmed, and readily bought the demoniac-building, which was capable of domiciliating ten Jesuits in what Bartoli calls a "most precious residence." Ricci took possession, whilst the Chinamen without expected to see or hear a battle between the Jesuit and the devils. Meanwhile Ricci fitted up the hall appropriately, constructed an altar, recited a few prayers, went from room to room sprinkling holy water—and never a devil was seen or heard, whilst the veteran Jesuit entertained a bevy of *literati*, *ad multam noctem*—to a late hour of the night, in a joyous and intellectual symposium. The Jesuit's elucidation of the affair is curious and as followeth :—"Leuteu, the man who sold the house to

¹ Ranke, 254 ; Juvenci, lib. xix. ; *Relatione della Cina dell' Anno 1621*.

Our men went about saying, ‘that the devils had been forced by the God of the fathers to infest the tenement—for, having observed all the prescribed rules in building the house [as to the position of doors and windows, as before stated], having complied with all the fortunate points of the prescription, he knew that the devils could not possibly have any power over the house. Therefore, the God of Father Ricci had given it over to them to disturb it, so that having rendered it uninhabitable to any one else, it might fall to the lot of him for whom it was reserved, at that very low price;—for, as soon as he entered the house, the spirits who had nothing more to do there, had decamped.’ Thus spoke this sage of the matter, and perhaps truly in every item”—*così ne parlava quel savio, e forse in tutto al vero.*¹

After Ricci’s death a violent persecution raged against the missionaries; they yielded to the storm and retired to Macao. In the following year, 1618, the Tartars poured down upon China, advancing to the capital. The emperor died, apparently through fright, and his grandson, Tien-Ki, undertook to repulse the barbaric marauders. It was insinuated to the king that artillery would prove an effectual means for dislodging the enemy:—but though the Chinamen had guns, they knew not how to manage them:—they sent to Macao for some Portuguese to teach them, and the Jesuits joined the expedition. Tien-Ki triumphed over the invaders by the help of the Portuguese and the Jesuits, drove out the Tartars, and retained the missionaries of his peace with the barbarians, through the ordeal of powder and shot. Great was the subsequent success of the Jesuits; the favour of the emperor and all the grandees

¹ Bartoli, della Cina, f. 333—335.

of the court and country pushed them along in glorious prosperity. Not a year passed in which thousands were not converted; their opponents died off; and in 1624, the famous Jesuit Adam Schall appeared on the scene. His accurate description of two eclipses of the moon which happened that year, and a treatise on the earthquake, by the Jesuit Lombardo, added fresh lustre to their reputation. Splendid was the renewed prospect of the mission. "Four years before a sharp gale arose against it, and seemed likely to sink it at one fell swoop; the pilots, obedient to the weather, furlled their sails and retreated apace, but so that they might be found by any one who required their aid—to wait till day should break and the shadows melt away. Up to the present time the whole evil has amounted to no more than alarm." Such is the Jesuit-description of the late transaction—the persecution—the retirement at Macao—where they were found by the Chinamen who needed them to manage their guns—and finally, the break of day to their renovated hopes, the shadows of disaster melting away.¹

Adam Schall's career is most remarkable. He was a German of good family, born at Cologne. He joined the Company in 1611, aged twenty, applied himself successfully to mathematics, and nine years afterwards went to the Chinese mission. His whole life was one of the most laborious that ever fell to the lot of humanity. Globes, sundials, mathematical instruments of every

¹ "Quattro anni fa se levò contro una gagliarda borasca, la quale pareva che la dovesse sommergere ad un tratto; li piloti accomodandosi al tempo, raccolsero le vele delle opere loro e si ritirarono alquanto, ma in modo che potevano essere trovati da chiunque voleva l'aiuto loro, per aspettare donec aspiet dies et inclinentur umbræ. Sin hora il male non è stato di altro che di timore." —*Relatione della Cina, ut antea*. Ranke, 254.

description, he constructed for the emperor, with the view of promoting the cause of the mission; and was ever on the alert to predict any astronomical phenomenon which might, by the event, enhance the reputation of the Christian teachers. In truth, if the cause of the Jesuits was not heavenly, it was certainly vastly promoted in the Celestial Empire by the starry phenomena. Whatever seemed likely to promote the cause of the mission was eagerly and vigorously embraced by this indefatigable Jesuit—and he humoured the superstitions of the nation. He announced to the king the approaching passage of the planet Jupiter through the two stars in Cancer—a phenomenon which, according to the Chinese astrologers, was a very bad omen, portending nothing less than the burning of the imperial city or the palace. The Chinese astronomers royal, who were jealous of the Jesuit, contradicted Ricci's predictions, and purposely falsified the observation at the time of its fulfilment. But the omen came to pass as well as the phenomenon. On the following day many houses close to the observatory took fire, and were burnt down with the loss of five hundred lives—thus convincing the emperor and people of the stubborn silence of the native astronomers, and that the phenomenon had really occurred. Commenting on this fact the Jesuit writer says that “God permits the errors which we love to punish our errors, or uses them adroitly to procure us a greater good.”¹ If the fact was not a mere accident, I fear that this axiom will not satisfactorily explain the conflagration.

¹ “Deumque, permissis erroribus, quos amamus, errores nostros plectere, aut dextrè illis uti ad procurandum bonum majus. Sequenti die pulvis pyrius casu accensus, ædes plurimas absumpsit, &c., simul Regi ac populo contra pervicax Eunuchorum silentium persuaserunt, veram fuisse eam astro-rum conjunctionem, ad quam talis strages secuta fuisset.”—*Hist. Relatio, ut antè*, pp. 25—27.

Not only astronomy and its instruments, but all the other sciences and their kindred arts, did the Jesuits bring to bear on the cause of the mission. Optical, hydraulic, and every other kind of instruments, not excepting the musical, were added to the curiosities of the Christian religion. An old harpsichord which Ricci had given the former emperor, was found in the palace and sent to Adam Schall to be repaired, with an order for the construction of a similar instrument! When Hamlet bitterly asked his companions to play the fife, it seemed unreasonable enough: but if one of our modern missionaries were asked to repair, nay, to construct a harpsichord, would it not be preposterous? It was not so to this Jesuit, however. "The father *eagerly* obeyed this *most desirable* command; and not to disappoint expectation, he wrote in Chinese a description of the art and method of the harpsichord, and set a psalm to music, thus more pleasantly to illustrate the instrument by the help of the voice." Thus, says the Jesuit, "he now determined, as the other instruments had not sufficiently succeeded, to introduce the law of God to the king, on the light fantastic toe—*cum tripudio*."¹ Whilst the harpsichord was being made, he translated a life of Christ into Chinese, and adorned the covers with letters of gold. A third present consisted of an image of the Three Kings adoring the Infant Jesus, made of wax, exceedingly life-like and so admirably coloured that they seemed to be alive:—Maximilian of Bavaria had sent them to be presented to the emperor;—a fact which shows what interest the Jesuits had excited in Europe about the Chinese mission. These presents, as

¹ "Meditabatur hac occasione legem Dei cum tripudio, siquidem aliis machinis nondum satis proficeret, ad Regem introducere."—*Historica Relatio, ut antea*, ab Ann. 1581; usque ad Ann. 1669, p. 36.

may be expected, made a great impression, and, if we may credit the Jesuits, operated many conversions at the Imperial Court, besides rendering the emperor more and more favourable to the religion they preached, on account of the wonderful talents and industry of the preachers, who positively came to the undertaking armed at all points—skilled in every art, trade, and profession. The irruptions of the Tartars were becoming too frequent, and the emperor was anxious to fortify his capital. Adam Schall was commanded and undertook to furnish a field of ordnance. He set to work, constructed a foundry ; the iron, brass, and pewter were supplied ; “innumerable hands,” a gang of Chinamen, “were ready ; and soon twenty big guns, chiefly forty-pounders, went forth, to the utter wonderment of the emperor and his celestials, who could not sufficiently “admire the art, the workmanship, the genius” of the Jesuit, when “the hollow engines, long and round, with touch of fire dilated and infuriate,” roared forth experimental thunder—

“From these deep-throated engines belch’d, whose roar
Embowell’d with outrageous noise the air.¹

Adam Schall consecrated the glorious achievement

¹ “Rex immani machinæ tonitru percussus, illico quid Patri Europæo acciderit, inquit. Re nuntiata, tormentum, ac pulveres inspicere ipse, mirari artem et operam, laudare vehementer ingenium voluit.”—*Ib. ut antea*, p. 65. Although gunpowder had long been in use with the Chinese, their organ of destructiveness had not suggested its European application to “such implements of mischief.”

“Yet haply of thy race
In future days, if malice should abound,
Some one, intent on mischief, or inspired
With devilish machination, might devise
Like instrument to plague the sons of men
For sin, on war and mutual slaughter bent.”

with Christian rites and ceremonies—anticipating the Chinamen, who were about to offer sacrifice to the Spirit of Fire amidst these “engines and their balls of missive ruin”—*Spiritui Ignis inter hæc ignium miracula sacrificaturi*. The Jesuit brought forth an image of Christ, placed it upon an altar which he had raised and ornamented for the purpose, and went through a ceremonial veneration, dressed in his surplice and stole. He ordered the workmen to do the same on bended knee, to call down the Divine assistance upon the labour. The emperor commanded his people to do as the Jesuit prescribed in this matter, as well as in all others, and rigorously forbade any resistance to his wishes; “for,” said he, and the words are remarkable, “these men [the Jesuits] *do not despise the spirits whom we adore*: but they tenaciously worship one God, and observe his laws.”¹

Adam Schall was then required to furnish the model of a fortification for the city:—he constructed one of wood, complete in all its parts; and the emperor commanded that preparations should forthwith be made for the construction. But one of the celestial dignitaries overruled the Jesuit’s plan, and substituted another, which was adopted, in spite of the Jesuit’s advice to the contrary. Schall rode round the works, and said to the overseers: “Were I a marauder, I would, from this very point, carry the city by assault in three days.”² The result verified his prediction; it was at the very spot which the Jesuit pointed out with his finger, that

¹ “Non enim, inquiebat, isti Spiritus, quos adoramus, despiciunt; sed tenaciter unum Deum colunt, ejusque præcepta custodiunt.”—*Hist. Relat., ut antea*, p. 66.

² “Si latro essem, inquit, hoc ipso ex loco urbem intra triduum expugnarem.”—*Ubi suprâ*, p. 70.

the marauders, very soon afterwards, stormed the city, flayed alive the rival projector of the fortification, when, in the sack and conflagration, the emperor hanged himself in despair.¹

The Tartars were invited to dislodge the marauders, which they did, but established themselves instead, for their trouble in the transaction—the universal method of humanity. Xun-chi, the Tartar prince who completed the conquest, lavished every benefaction on Adam Schall, and appointed him president of the mathematical tribunal. During the previous reign, he was charged with the department of astronomy and the construction of the astrological calendar : but under the Tartar-prince, Adam Schall was omnipotent. Xun-chi treated him with the greatest familiarity ; and all that came to him from the Jesuit—even the sharpest and most frequent remonstrances—met with a kind and deferential reception. He not only admitted Schall at all times into his palace, but often visited him at his own residence, and spent hours together with the useful, the fascinating Jesuit—but he did not become a Christian. In return for the Jesuit's utility to himself in particular, and the whole country in general, the emperor gratefully tolerated the Jesuit's religion, and permitted his subjects to please themselves in the matter of conversion, which, according to the Jesuits, numbered, in fourteen years, 100,000 proselytes.²

It was during this reign that the first Christian church was publicly opened in China,—and the fact is remarkable. During the previous eighty years of the mission, either for want of funds or by their dread of

¹ See chap. viii. and ix. of the *Hist. Relatio*, for the events alluded to in the text.

² *Hist. Relat. ut antea* ; Lett. Edif. *ut antea* ; Feller, Biog. Univ. t. xviii, p. 221.

giving offence to the Chinese, the Jesuits had contented themselves with private chapels, constructed in their houses, to which they used to admit some of the pagans for the sake of edification, together with their converts.¹ “But at length, by the favour of God, *and the pursuits of astronomy paving the way*, when the Tartars obtained the sceptre, they bought up cheaply a quantity of building materials from the ruins of the city, lately sacked, without asking permission for the same, because they thought that the Tribunal of Rites would object to granting the license, reserved to that tribunal by the law of the land; but acting on their own authority, which, in the last few years, their reformation of the almanacs and the favour of the emperor had fostered, in the seventh year of his reign, in 1650, a temple was begun, and finished in the following year, chiefly at the expense of the grandees and our friends.”² Nothing could exceed the magnificence of this Christian temple, and its adjoining chapel of the Virgin, for the use of the Chinese women, who were always separated from the men, according to the manners and customs of the Chinese, and “the proper institution in the Divine law,” says the Jesuit, meaningly—*ad propriam in lege Divinâ institutionem*. The body of the temple was divided into three sections, with columns and a cupola

¹ Hist. Relat. *ut antea*, cap. xviii. p. 230.

² “Deo tandem dante, et Astronomiæ studiis viam facientibus, postquam Tartari sceptrum tenuere, occasione exustæ urbis, et dirutarum ædium, quæ ad fabricam necessaria abunde præstiterunt, magnâ vi laterum ac lapidum et materiæ facili pretio coemptâ, nullâ quidem tum petitâ licentiâ, quod Tribunal Rituum, lege Regni, hanc sibi reservatam ægrè concessuram crederetur: sed solâ autoritate audente, quam intra paucos annos instauratio Ephemeridum, et gratia novi Principis pepererat, anno septimo imperii, qui quinquagesimus fuit post sexcentessimum millesimum, datum templo initium est, Regulorum maximè et amicorum sumptibus, insequenti anno perfectum.”—*Hist. Relat., ut antea*, p. 231.

elegantly painted. There was a propyleum with a portico, and its seats for the shelter of the fathers in hot or rainy weather. In the centre of the court was an arch of white marble, with various engraved figures upon it, intersected with three smaller arches below, forming gateways. There were five altars in the temple. On the largest was seen “the Saviour seated, in one hand supporting the world, with the other, as it were, blessing the people, attended by a host of angels, and apostles kneeling around. The other altars represented the patriarchs Ignatius and Francis Xavier. Another on the left, was sacred to the Blessed Virgin, which is called the greater ; at the right, (an inferior position, according to the Chinese) holy Michael, with the angels, was worshipped (*colitur*). All were provided with lattice-work for ornament and to keep off the vulgar. In the whole temple they burnt wax that rivalled snow in whiteness, such as the emperor and the empress used, and four or five times dearer than any other ; it was abundantly supplied for the purpose by the empress-dowager. It was not only burnt on the altars, but also on the tables on which, before each altar, the fumes of incense arose on the greater festivals. From the walls hung gilt tablets, with the commandments, the works of mercy, the beatitudes, and other axioms of the Catechism, inscribed upon them in conspicuous Chinese. The pavement was tessellated, but still covered with carpets, for ornament and comfort : these were changed for better ones on great and solemn festivals. On a marble tablet within was seen the following inscription :—

“After the faith was first introduced by St. Thomas the Apostle, and after the same was again far and widely propagated by the Chinese in the time of the

reign Tàm ; thirdly, again, under the reign Mìm, the leaders being St. *Francis Xavier* (!) and afterwards Father Matteo Ricci, by men of the Company of Jesus, the faith being diffused by preaching and books published in Chinese, with great application, indeed, and labour, but with fruit not sufficiently plentiful, on account of the nation's unsteadiness—the empire having now fallen to the Tartars, the same Company (*by way of crowning her labours in the reformation of the calendar*, called Xy Liêu Lie, effected by her members) has publicly erected and dedicated this temple to God—*optimus maximus*—in the year of Jubilee 1650, the seventh year of the Emperor Xùn-Chy.”¹ Numerous other inscriptions figured on the walls or the arches—one by the emperor, one by the president of the Tribunal of Rites, and one by the sixty-sixth descendant of *Confucius*, who was the actual president of the literati. Others immortalised the names of Ricci, Jacob Rho, another indefatigable Jesuit, John Terentius, and Adam Schall.²

Here, then, is the result of eighty years' incalculable toil and trouble. From their own words it is evident that these Jesuits ascribed their establishment to their scientific qualifications, chiefly in astronomy ; — and never before nor since, have the mechanical and liberal arts been able to steal an establishment in any country.

¹ “Post fidem à Divo Thomâ Apostolo primùm advectam, postque eandem à Sinis tempore Imperii Tàm iterum et latius propagatam : tertio rursum sub Imperio Mìm, Ducibus S. Francisco Xaverio, ac postea P. Matthæo Riccio, per Societatis Jesu homines, et verbo et libris Sinicè editis, divulgatam, magno tum equidem studio et labore, sed fructu propter Gentis inconstantiam non satis fœcundo ; devoluto jam ad Tartaros Imperio, eadem Societas pro instaurati per suos Calendarii, Xy Liêu Liè dicti, laborum coronide, Templum hoc Deo Optimo Maximo publicè posuit dicavitque, anno Jubilæo millesimo sexcentesimo quinquagesimo, Imperatoris Xùnchy septimo.”—*Hist. Relatio, ut antea*, pp. 230—234.

² *Ib. ut antea*, pp. 234—236.

A blessing, therefore, on these inventions of man—a triple blessing on astronomy, if they enabled a handful of Jesuits to give to Heaven 100,000 Christians, besides a magnificent church, exceedingly like a pagan temple in all its parts and appendages.

Adam Schall, the worthy hero of the achievement, rose successively through the nine orders of the mandarins, until he reached the first, as represented by his portrait, in costume,—as prime minister of the Emperor of China.

Not only was Schall himself ennobled, but his father and his mother, his grandfather and his grandmother. Xun-chi, in his diploma *ex cæli mandato*—"by a mandate from Heaven," makes the following very striking observation. "I, by the grace of God, emperor, declare that, as often as God sends into this world, a man, conspicuous for his probity and fidelity, so often does He also provide a king who is willing and able to use and gratify him"—which may be a peculiar practice in the Celestial Empire, but the axiom would never have been invented or suggested in Europe. In the imperial diploma for Schall's father, the emperor begins in the same way as before, and declares "that those who are endowed with any virtue or excellence, have received it for the most part from their parents"—an incontestable fact, but which none scarcely seem to believe and act upon—before they undertake to become parents. To Schall's mother the emperor observed, that as she had taken great care of her Adam, there was no wonder that the result had appeared in his proficiency—a Chinese hint for mothers, of some little importance, particularly to the teachers of their children, who can always discover whether a pupil has a good mother—in fact *a* mother. Still following

out his right notions of hereditary transmission, the emperor tells Schall's grandfather, that he "contemplates him in his grandson," whose qualifications are so admirable ; and he declares to his grandmother that she was "the root" of the tree which was now flourishing in China, spreading mechanical branches, musical leaves, pictorial flowers, mathematical, astronomical fruits of every description — with some hundred thousand disciples.¹

I regret that I must record the bitter downfall of this extraordinary man. His patron died, and a minority ensued. The men in power seized the Jesuits, whom they loaded with chains and exiled to Canton. Adam Schall was deprived of his dignities, overwhelmed with opprobrium and calumny, was imprisoned and chained in a horrible dungeon, and even condemned, as the head of "the infamous sect," to be hacked and cut to pieces. Meanwhile, however, the imperial palace was consumed by fire, a great many houses were overturned by an earthquake, and the people, according to the Jesuits, considering these events as the punishments of Heaven, demanded the liberation of Schall and the other Jesuits : but Schall, worn out with years and sufferings, expired soon after, some say in prison once more, aged seventy-five, forty-four of which he wasted on the Chinese and the scheme of the Company.² Look at his calm, delightful face once more—and feel that you could love and esteem such a man, whether Jesuit or not, if I be not mistaken.

The fate of the mission was again decided by the

¹ *Relatio, ut antea*, pp. 345—352. Schall received these diplomas when only in the third order of mandarins : others were added when he rose to the top of the ladder.

² *Feller, ut antea* ; *Lett. Edif. ut antea*.

arts and sciences. By the time the young emperor reached his majority, the Chinese calendar and astrological almanacs had become involved in utter confusion, ever since Schall had ceased to be president of the mathematical tribunal. They could not dispense with the European mathematicians. All had been exiled or imprisoned ; but three of the learned stock were still at Peking. They were summoned by the emperor as soon as he was apprised of the facts which disgraced his minority ; for there can be no doubt in the world that those Jesuits were of immense advantage to the Chinese, in their own estimation ; and as it is highly probable that the religion taught by the Jesuits was a *juste milieu* between the Creed of Confucius and that of Rome, nothing but execrable jealousy could have ousted them, and deprived the venerable Schall of a calm and placid departure from amidst his glorious achievements. The three Jesuits were soon in the imperial presence, and received with kindness. The calendar was confided to the reforming energies of Father Ferdinand Verbiest ; who forthwith detected more than twenty important blunders, which he reported to the emperor, who thereupon was inspired with great esteem for the Jesuit. The immediate result was a restoration of the mission in 1671. In the following year, a maternal uncle of the emperor, and one of his generals, received baptism. Verbiest was a worthy successor of Ricci and Schall—yea, the very column of the Chinese church as long as he lived. He enjoyed the favour of the emperor, to whom he gave lessons in mathematics,—edging in appropriate hints of Christian doctrine, but all to no purpose. Mathematics were the desideratum : the Celestial Emperor needed no more from the Jesuit ;

but he gratefully exhibited, semi-barbarian as he was, due respect to the religion which he could not comprehend, for the sake of its teachers, who were useful, and ready and eager to render him any service whatever. Accordingly, Kang-Hi made Verbiest president of the mathematical tribunal, and permitted funereal honours to be celebrated by way of reparation to the memory of the lamented Adam Schall, sending a mandarin to represent the imperial identity.¹

It is remarkable that in the previous proscription of the Jesuits, no persecution of their disciples in China gave martyrs to the phantom church. A few mandarins, Schall's disciples, may have been disgraced with the leader, but no notice was taken of the little people that might still continue to be absent from the celebration of the national ceremonials. However, the Jesuits now began anew at the point of Schall's departure,—and with the most encouraging prospects.

French Jesuits were now to appear on the scene. Louis XIV., whose career we shall soon behold at a glance, “had comprehended the changes which such a state of affairs in China induced in Europe. In order some day to ensure to France the *plenitude of commerce* in those empires, he gave to the Chinese mission a national recommendation. Father Verbiest seconded his desires.”² He obtained from Kang-Hi an edict, by which the Christian religion was declared holy and without reproach. Pope Innocent XI., in 1681, wrote the Jesuit a breve of encouragement;—“for there was nothing that might not be expected, with the aid of heaven, from you and men like yourself,” said he to Verbiest, “giving influence to religion in those countries.”

¹ Lett. Edif. *ut antea* ; Cretineau, v. 50.

² Cretineau, v. 51.

Political events tended to augment the credit of the Jesuits at the court of Pekin. The Chinese general, who had invited the Tartars to dislodge the marauders, now revolted, and the western provinces of the empire sided with the rebel. In the strongholds of the mountains he seemed to defy the imperial armies. Kang-Hi resolved to reduce the miscreant, but something was wanting: it was remembered by his older generals, and it was *cannon*, so rife with the memory of Schall. Now, the Jesuit Verbiest accompanied the Chinese army:—he was ordered to found guns of various calibres. Had the Jesuits changed? Was Verbiest not aware of Schall's example? Still the Jesuits say, by the pen of Cretineau, in these our times, that Verbiest replied to the effect that his mission was to bring down the blessings of heaven on men, not to furnish them with new means of destruction. Thereupon he was suspected of favouring the enemy; he and his companions and converts were threatened with persecution; he yielded to the orders; set up a foundry; directed the works; the messengers of death went forth; and Kang-Hi had to thank the Jesuit for victory.¹ Surely the alleged demur of this Jesuit, coupled with his subsequent submission, is not half so respectable as that of Schall, who only demurred as to his idea that he would not be able to execute what he had learned by theory.²

Verbiest, in return for his services in the war, requested and obtained permission from the emperor, to increase

¹ Cretineau, v. 51, 52.

² "Respondere festinanti Pater (Schall): hæc se in libris tradita, non in castris; lectione, non usu hausisse: aliud omnino esse ingenium operi, aliud manum admovere: experientiâ plurimum in mechanicis profici."—*Hist. Relativ*, ut antea, p. 64.

the number of his mathematicians. This was the French expedition before alluded to, set on foot by Louis XIV. and his confessor, La Chaise, with ulterior views by both, never destined, however, to obtain their unmerited fulfilment. Six French Jesuits reached China in 1688. It was the first expedition in which the Jesuits avowed that the propagation of their religion was not their object; they came as the envoys of Louis XIV. for astronomical observation and scientific discoveries—operating unto “the plenitude of French commerce in those empires.”¹ The thoughtful reader will at once perceive the bewilderment of the Company, when, in the face of all her institute and declarations to mankind, a number of her men could sally forth, expressly in the service of a royal despot, to advance his ambitious schemes, under the disguise of astronomy and science. Nevertheless the Jesuits, always the most accommodating men in the world, managed to unite the duties of their professional instinct with the requirements of their royal master, and his mighty confessor Père La Chaise, who was virtually the general of the French Jesuits, and the grand promoter of the enterprise to Siam at the same time, and connected with the Chinese expedition. It appears that the Jesuit Couplet, a Dutchman, was the person who stimulated the confessor, with the hope of the great advantages which would accrue to the Company by the establishment of the French in Siam, to the disadvantage of the Dutch, then engrossing its commerce. The rich pagodas of the pagans were a desirable acquisition to the enterprising gratis-collegians, whilst the

¹ Cretineau, v. 53. “Afin d’assurer un jour à la France, la plenitude du commerce dans ces empires, il chercha à donner à la mission Chinoise un cachet national.”

extension of French commerce served as a motive to influence the king. La Chaise furnished the Jesuits Fontenay, Gerbillon, Le Comte Visdelou, Bouvet and Tachard, all of them learned mathematicians, destined for China and Siam, from which last country a pretended embassy had been sent to Louis XIV., with advances from its king. The embassy consisted of two "mandarins," stated to have been brought over by the Jesuit Couplet before-mentioned. Two ships of war carried the exploring expedition, and La Chaise sent a letter to Verbiest at the Court of China, recommending the French Jesuits to his favour and patronage. "Thus," says Father Tachard, "we resigned with France, the sweetness and repose of religious life, which we had enjoyed till then, in order to go and seek, at the world's end, the opportunity for procuring the greater glory of God, and to consecrate ourselves to the conversion of the infidels, in executing the commands of our great monarch."¹

When the French Jesuits reached China, the Portuguese Jesuits objected to receive them : for the Portuguese had hitherto monopolised the commerce of China, and the Portuguese Jesuits were afraid to displease their king.² This fact proves the political object of the expedition : as mere missionaries, the Frenchmen would have been acceptable as well as men of any other nation : the Jesuits in China knew the purpose of the French Jesuits, and either on that account, or through the spirit of nationality everywhere more or less prevalent in the Company, they demurred ; but the Frenchmen prevailed, and, three months after their installation,

¹ Tachard, *Voyage de Siam*, p. 22 ; *Hist. of Father La Chaise*, pp. 312—318.

² Cretineau, v. 53.

Gerbillon and his brother-Jesuit Pereyra were dispatched by the Chinese emperor as his ambassadors to the Czar of Russia : they had to negotiate a peace, and to regulate the limits of the two empires. Gerbillon succeeded in ratifying the conditions offered by the emperor, who, on the Jesuit's return, received him with high honour, and appointed him his master in mathematics ; whilst Bouvet was made professor of philosophy ; and both enjoyed the distinction of being the guests of the imperial table, the companions of his walks and journeys, and his physicians. They obtained permission to build a church and a residence in the enclosure of the palace-domains, and in 1692 an imperial edict was procured, granting permission for the preaching of the faith all over the empire : but the emperor still remained a pagan.¹

Missioners of the faith, astronomers, astrologers, musicians, mechanics, mathematicians, gun-founders, gunners, everything and anything by turns, the Jesuits became famous as physicians. Their lay-brothers applied to this department ;—Bernard Rhodes and Pierre Traperie especially distinguished themselves in this faculty. Rhodes cured the emperor of a dangerous malady, and received for his reward ingots of gold to the amount of about 8000*l*.²

¹ Cretineau, v. 54.

² Cretineau, v. 54. This money was deposited with the East India Company, on interest. At the suppression of the *other* Company, the East India Company, like all the Catholic powers, confiscated the money, applying the interest to the hospitals. But the Jesuits sent a deputy from India to represent their case to the board. They were kindly heard, the arrears were paid up, and the interest was given till the death of the last Jesuit-missionary. In 1813 the Propaganda transferred this money from the Jesuits to the Lazarists of China. Whilst the honesty of the board stands in contrast with the despotic injustice of the Roman Propaganda, we must not, for the sake of historical justice, fail to remark the

Triumphant was the progress of the Jesuits : their talents and scientific attainments achieved wealth, honours, and renown. The court of Pekin was the asylum of the sons of Loyola : the pagan emperor showered honours on the men of science. Father Dominic Parrenin became grand mandarin, like Adam Schall. His portrait is now before me, and well he looks the character. *Nostri barbam non immittant*, say the Constitutions of Loyola ; but the mandate is gloriously superseded, and the Jesuit-mandarin sedately sports the honours of the lip and a luxuriant beard : his mandarin-cap emphatically proclaims his “ holy poverty ” to be a standard equivocation. With merited applause he was mediator between the Russian and Chinese cabinets, and Peter the Great forgot the Jesuit in the easy diplomatist, and lavished honours on the statesman. Bouvet, another Jesuit, and “ imperial geographer,” vied with a third, Father Gaubil, in “ rendering science the vehicle to the good graces of the emperor.”¹ Immense were their labours ; but they were deprived of the honour due to their exertions. The academies of Europe pilfered their ideas and discoveries, without acknowledgment. “ In these circumstances,” writes Gaubil to Father Souciet, “ it is a vast deal that the gentlemen of the Observatoire have aided you in the construction and verification of the micrometers, &c.,—that they have examined the observations, that they think of making use of them :—I care not at all if they name me or not : but I wish it to be known that those contributions are from the French Jesuits, whom the king maintains in China. This is for

fact that so large a sum was received by the gratis-labourers of Loyola. The reign of avarice had commenced, and with ambition tormented the Company. The fact is given by Cretineau, *ubi suprâ*.

¹ Cretineau, v. 77

the common good [of the Company], and I care not at all for the small honour that might accrue to myself. Of all the missionaries, I am the least meritorious.”¹

In the possession of substantial power, the Jesuits might proudly scorn the petty vanities of the frivolous :—but the letter which we have read exhibits human nature as strong, or rather, as weak as ever—judged by the standard of the Constitutions, &c.

Pliant conformity to circumstances, when absolutely necessary—but steadfast, unbending pertinacity when it seemed likely to triumph, were the constant characteristics of the Jesuits. In India they at length effected and confirmed a spiritual revolution. They had fallen in with a primitive community, known by the name of the Christians of St. Thomas the Apostle. These religionists recognised as the head of the universal Church, not the Pope of Rome, of whom they had never heard, but the “Patriarch of Babylon,” at Mosul. Measures were immediately taken to draw them into the communion of the Roman Church. Neither force nor persuasion were spared. In 1601, the most eminent among them seemed won over, and a Jesuit was appointed their bishop. The Roman ritual was printed in Chaldaic : the errors of Nestorius, a primitive heretic, were anathematised in a diocesan council ; a Jesuit-college was erected at Cranganor ; the new installation in the episcopal see took place in 1624, with the approbation of the most obstinate of the former opponents. Of course the political superiority of the Portuguese and Spanish power conduced largely to these results so glorious to the Jesuits.²

The same political influence promoted the stubborn

¹ Cretineau, v. 79.

² Ranke, 255 ; Cordara, P. 6. lib. ix. p. 535.

assaults of the Jesuits on Abyssinia—Loyola's Ethiopia. All the former attempts were utterly ineffectual, though ruinous to the natives. In 1603, the Portuguese rendered important service to the Abyssinians in a battle, and obtained high credit for themselves and their religion. The Jesuit Paez was at hand—a clever Jesuit, if the epithet be necessary to qualify an ancient Loyolan of the epoch now before us. Paez preached in the language of the country. He gained access to the court. The victorious sovereign wished to form a closer alliance with the King of Spain, in self-defence against his foes of the interior. Paez represented to him the necessity of his abjuring his schismatic doctrines and conforming to Rome, as the only means of effectuating that alliance. The Portuguese were useful: they had defended him: the Abyssinian felt inclined to comply:—but preliminaries were necessary, as on all occasions when men are impelled by mere expediency to the perpetration of questionable deeds. Public disputations—the Jesuit-method—were appointed: the ignorant monks were easily put down: the bravest man in the kingdom, Sela-Christos, a brother of the Emperor Susnejos, was converted; and his example was followed by countless numbers. And then an alliance was formed with Pope Paul V. and Philip III. A religious war ensued. The abuna and his monks joined the rebels of the interior; Sela-Christos and the Portuguese, with the Jesuits and their converts, sided with the emperor. Battles were fought year after year: success alternated with defeat: at length the emperor was victorious. The victory was shared by Catholicism and the Jesuits. The religion of the country was proscribed, Catholic churches and chapels were erected in the emperor's cities and

gardens :—he was formally reconciled to the Roman Church by the Jesuit Paez, who gave him the communion according to the Catholic ritual ; and in 1622, Pope Gregory XV. sent a Portuguese Jesuit, Alfonso Mendez, proposed by King Philip, to officiate as—Patriarch of Ethiopia. The emperor thereupon solemnly tendered his obedience to the Pope of Rome ; the Jesuit Paez built him a magnificent palace, which the traveller Bruce notifies with admiration of its ruins. Mendez with his Jesuits enjoyed the triumph of the faith. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the country, nay, the royal prerogative was set at nought. A monk, the chief of his Order, died without abjuration, and was buried at the foot of the altar in a church where the patriarch had interred another monk who had conformed. The Jesuit had him disinterred and thrown on a dunghill. Fierce contention, terrible battles ensued : rebels arose in every quarter against their persecuting sovereign, impelled by the triumphant Jesuits. He led forth his army, gained the victory, leaving on the field 8000 of his subjects slaughtered in the horrible cause of religion. This frightful victory struck terror even in the victors. His courtesans led the emperor to the ghastly scene, expostulating on the iniquitous warfare. Their remonstrance amid that field of blood took effect—a deep melancholy settled on his mind : he relented ; and granted toleration to his subjects. The Jesuit Tellez calls this decree impious and sacrilegious : but universal joy was its result, and the cause of Rome, no longer aided by the musket, fell to the ground. Susnejos died in 1632 ; his son and successor promoted his father's repentant toleration, in spite of the patriarch's remonstrance. “ Was it by arguments that you esta-

blished your faith?" he asked Mendez. "Was it not by violence and tyranny?" Many other provocations decided the fate of this Jesuit mission. The Jesuits "laid a secret design to betray the empire of Ethiopia to the Portuguese dominion; whereof they were undeniably convicted by divers letters written to carry on the treason, which were seasonably intercepted. Under the pretence of building churches and colleges, they raised fortifications and strongholds in many advantageous parts of the country; and a vast quantity of instruments for the erecting of mounds and bulwarks, with other warlike preparations, were, upon strict search, found in their houses. In short, they did inordinately enrich themselves, and were intolerably insolent,—which first bred among the Abyssinians a suspicion that they rather aimed at the gold and government of Ethiopia, than the salvation of its inhabitants."¹ In addition to this discovery, the new emperor, Fasilades, was threatened with invasion by a neighbouring prince, if he did not ratify the rights of the national religion; and "having therefore granted the patriarch forty servants, letters of safe conduct, and license to transport whatsoever his father had bestowed upon him, he strictly enjoins him and all the Roman fathers to depart the empire without delay, and, by public decree, makes it a capital offence for any of them to be found in his territories, on any pretence whatever." Three Jesuits remained, and were put to death, with others of the party, "for their obstinacy;" nor did the emperor spare his own uncle, "then seventy years old, but condemned him to a tedious imprisonment. In a word, Susnejos, the father, was not more zealous and active to plant the Roman

¹ The Hist. of Ethiopia, by Wanslaben, "a learned papist," 1679, pp. 24 *et seq.*

faith in Abyssinia, than Fasilades, his son and successor, was to extirpate and abolish it.”¹ He persecuted the converts, and successfully expelled the Jesuits. By their sufferings in a disastrous retreat from the scene of their machinations, they partly atoned for the miseries which they and their party had inflicted on the Abyssinians.²

But it was not everywhere the same with the Jesuits—neither as to unbending severity or disaster. It may be some relief to turn from their measures with heretics, and schismatics, to the pagans, among whom they were gods. In South America a luxuriant Catholicism had grown up amidst the ruin, the spoliation, the desolation of the Indians. As early as the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Catholic Church of South America included an establishment of five archbishoprics, twenty-seven bishoprics, four hundred convents, innumerable parishes and curacies held by friars, or Indian villages newly consecrated to the faith. Magnificent cathedrals had risen; spacious and comfortable convents around, deepened the shades of that vicissitude in the fortunes of the Indians, on which it was impossible that

¹ The Hist. of Ethiopia, 25 *et seq.* “As soon as these affairs were thoroughly made known, and impartially stated at Rome, the College *De Propagandâ Fide*, upon mature consideration of their ill success and its as just as apparent occasion, resolved to lay aside the Jesuits as improper instruments for that enterprise; and in their stead made choice of some religious persons of the Order of Mendicant Friars, to manage their designs upon Ethiopia. Accordingly, certain Capuchins were deputed for that charge, and ordered to proceed on their journey thither in the year 1636.”—*Ubi suprâ*, p. 26. These poor Capuchins met with a sorry fate: they were actually “hanged with those very ropes which themselves had made use of for their girdles.”—P. 31.

² Ranke, 255; Cordara, P. 6. p. 320; Juvenci, p. 705; La Croze, l. iii. pp. 296—320. The Jesuits in their retreat from Abyssinia were arrested by the Pacha of Suakem, and he refused to let them proceed without the payment of 30,000 piastres by way of ransom. The general of the Jesuits appealed to Cardinal Richelieu, the French consul in Egypt received orders to take steps for their liberation, and the pacha was forced to give up his prey.—*Cretineau*, v. 20.

Heaven should look with approbation. Here and there partial good may have been effected by those troops of monks and friars, who accompanied the freebooters of Spain and Portugal : but we have long since beheld the national results of a luxurious, debauched, proud, and sensual clergy in the colonies of both hemispheres.¹ In the face of undeniable facts, the romances put forth by themselves and their partisans, and echoed by credulous Protestants, may serve to amuse or edify the frivolous, who neither consider the antecedents nor the consequences of monkish domination in the Americas. The miserable Indians scarcely had reason to be satisfied with the useful arts, and the religion taught them, in return for their wealth and liberty. In the gorgeous ceremonials which delighted them,—in the music and song which charmed their ears with psalmody,—in the fantastic imaginings of their minds, confounding pagan ideas with Catholic representations, their dreams by night may have been occasionally sweetened—but they themselves were, in sad reality, dwindling, perishing from the face of the land—making room for the avaricious

¹ The following is, perhaps, the most *lenient* account of the Romish clergy. It was written from a Dominican convent, in 1797 : “The liberty which the ecclesiastics enjoy here enables them to mix in all companies Piety even seems to hide her head, and shrink abashed at some of their sallies ; and the freedom which the women enjoy here does not a little encourage the growth of infidelity. I have talked several times with Don Manuel upon this particular, and he declares that the state winks at the dissolute lives of the clergy, that they may, by their example, give a new turn to the modes of worship formerly observed by the Jesuits ; and by the levity of their conduct, lessen the reverence with which the Indians were wont to regard their religious governors ; whose interest among the natives the court has long been jealous of, and wished to undermine. How far this may be good policy I will not pretend to say, but it certainly has a very destructive and dangerous appearance.”—*Davie, Letters from Paraguay*, p. 170. It is a striking retribution that the very governments which the clergy at first aided to enslave the Indians, now proscribed them with similar selfishness to that which actuated them in their former favours.

and ambitious Christian invaders, with whom their spiritual guides had struck alliance.

Somewhat different, apparently, were the operations of the Jesuits among the Indians of America. Much more regulated in their conduct, under stricter supervision at all times, they were able at least to bring higher civilising powers to bear on the destinies of the savage. By the year 1636 the Company was widely established in the Spanish and Portuguese settlements of America : but in Paraguay they were trying an experiment which seemed to them likely to eventuate a lasting “theocracy,”—although they knew that the most striking and only sample of the kind on record—as given in the Bible—proved a failure at last—and the last state was much worse than the first, the “theocracy” being intermediate.

The Province of Paraguay had no boundaries on the north or the south, excepting those which the ardour of the Jesuits prescribed to their labours. Oceans laved it on both sides. The whole continent of South America was the field of operation. Numerous colleges, houses and residences attested the activity of the fathers : but their scheme of seclusion and government for the Indians was, and is, one of the most curious attempts of Loyola’s adventurous progeny. They collected the Indians into villages, called reductions, whence they rigorously excluded all Europeans not connected with the Company. In 1632, there were twenty reductions, each containing about 1,000 families, which is stated to mean many thousand men. Two Jesuits had the charge of each reduction, in general, but only one when the village was poor. The Jesuit was their king, master, teacher, physician, architect, farmer ; in a word, he had supreme dominion over the savages whom he could manage to

collect and retain in the reductions.¹ In forming a reduction of men who “had only the name and figure of the human race,” the Jesuits appointed certain officials over them, to whom they gave the classic names of consuls, prætors, and other Roman or Spanish titles. Rules and regulations were appointed; the penalty for their infringement was public castigation. Each man had his portion of ground allotted to him, which, at stated times, he ploughed, sowed, dressed, and reaped by command. Frequent visitations and constant supervision tended to stimulate the exertions of the savages.²

No one was permitted to leave the village without express permission from the father.³

The boys were taught the Catechism the first thing in the morning; then they ranged themselves into two classes,—one for reading and writing, the other for vocal and instrumental music. Mutual instruction was enforced. They heard mass every day; and were assembled again before noon, together with the girls, for religious instruction. When the church-bell sounded, thrice a day, for the *Angelus*, or salutation of the Virgin, the whole population instantly set aside the work in hand, fell on their knees, and, all together raising their voices, sang a hymn and certain prayers set to music for them, containing the chief points of Christian doctrine.

On great festivals the reductions invited each other; the fathers came together, the musicians united their bands, and all made merry with dance, and song, and jollity, in which the fathers shared, till evening.

One of the fathers visited every house daily, to see

¹ Litt. Ann. Prov. Paraquariæ, 1636, pp. 37, 38.

² *Ubi suprâ*, 40.

³ *Ubi suprâ*.

after the sick. "The fathers seek out and administer medicines to the patients ; prepare and cook their food for them, and even bleed them. And this is the most powerful means whereby their barbarous minds can be mollified. For at first it was impossible to induce them to receive the fathers into their houses, or to permit them to see their wives, until, in process of time, they found out how beneficial the fathers might prove to them in their affairs ; and now they crave their visits with importunity, particularly when any of them is ill." ¹

The father was supreme judge in the reduction. His sentence settled every dispute ; and so great was his authority, and the general opinion of his integrity, that his decision was received without murmurings or resistance. The youth exhibited the greatest deference, respect, and affection to the fathers, in every respect like the novices of the Company. They walked with decorum, modesty on their brow, and mostly with eyes downcast to the ground. They obeyed the slightest hint ; and they were, in this matter, so well exercised, that they frequently anticipated the command. They confessed their sins frequently, shed copious tears for the least faults, received the sacrament, recited daily the rosary and other prayers, and were particularly devout to the queen of heaven. They lacerated themselves with a whip much oftener than once a week, and tortured their little bodies with a hair shirt. Such is

¹ " Patres enim ægris corporibus medicinas et quærunt et applicant ; iis cibum conficiunt, conduntque ; atque adeò suis manibus ægrorum venas incidunt. Atque id potentissimum medium, quo barbari eorum animi deleniuntur. Nullâ enim ratione, initio, adduci poterant ut Patres domos ingredi, aut uxores vel intueri paterentur : donec labente tempore cognovêre, quanto rebus suis Patres essent emolumento : atque adeò eos jam ut ad se venire dignentur, præcipuè ubi eorum aliquis morbo affectus fuerit, multis precibus obtestantur."—*Litt. Ann.*, ut antea, p. 43.

their purity, that when they speak to women—even their own mothers—they fix their eyes on the ground.¹

These youths are the most faithful scouts and informers. They reproach the delinquents, and report the sins, quarrels, and everything else that may chance among the people. Malefactors are abhorred by none more than these boys; and whatever they find out, they instantly report to the fathers. Their mothers themselves, when they are confessing, and are questioned as to any particular sin, usually reply thus:—"I have not committed that sin, for my son admonished me about it."²

Such are the skeleton facts of the scheme in general. From the Jesuit Charlevoix, I shall proceed to select illustrations of the results. These Indians were, according to Charlevoix, very vicious: "their brutalised reason had preserved scarcely a trace of natural religion. Miracles were necessary to convert them; and He who had inspired the missionaries with the design, did not withhold miraculous interposition. He began with miracles of terror, which produced a great effect. The cacique of the Reduction de Loretto had displayed great zeal for that establishment, and had been the first to receive baptism. He even put away his concubine. They abridged the time of his probation. He relapsed, resumed his former way of living. The missionaries tried persuasion and mildness to reclaim him. Then they threatened him with the wrath of heaven—with excommunication, if he did not retrace his steps. He still resisted. Then," says the Jesuit, "after having abused the mercies of the Lord, he felt all the rigour of his justice. One day, whilst he was alone in his hut, it

¹ *Ubi suprâ*, pp. 44, 45.

² *Ubi suprâ*, 45.

took fire suddenly on all sides ; he could neither put it out nor escape : he was burnt alive, and taught the new Christians, at his own cost, that there is a jealous God in heaven, and that we cannot despise with impunity the advice which his ministers give us, on his part.”¹

Without attempting to explain this miraculous interposition *in terrorem*, it may serve to show how both the young and the old members of their “Happy Christendom” fared in the reductions in case the will of the fathers was not strictly obeyed. All the missions were formed nearly on the same plan, and communicated with each other. Only one language was taught and used throughout the reductions. Total isolation from the Europeans was the object of the Jesuits. The most fruitful and healthy spots were chosen for these villages, and all were built in a regular and similar form, the streets of one breadth, extending in right lines, and meeting in one central square. Each village had its church, built in the most conspicuous situation. The churches were in general handsome buildings, designed with no small taste and skill in architecture, by the missionaries, and decorated with paintings and pieces of sculpture, sent as presents by pious Catholics in Europe. Close to the church was the house inhabited by the missionaries. To them were associated six boys, chosen from among the natives ; and together they formed a chapter, or religious community, having all the laws appointed with monastic regularity.

In every village there was a workhouse, or place of confinement for disorderly women. There was likewise an arsenal, replenished with all sorts of weapons in use

¹ Hist. du Paraguay, i. 231, 4to edit.

among the Europeans, provided with a small train of artillery and a proportionate quantity of ammunition. The inhabitants were trained to arms, distributed into companies, and the most intelligent among them were chosen as officers. These were distinguished by uniforms decorated with gold-lace, and they bore in some conspicuous part of their dress a device indicative of the place where they commanded. The evening of every holiday was a time of exercise for the troops, in which they went through their evolutions.

In the schools some of the boys were taught to read Latin and Spanish—but only to pronounce the language, not to understand or speak it : they had to read to the community during meal-time ; and such was their faculty of imitation, that they read as though they understood the language.

Everywhere there were workshops for gilders, painters, and sculptors ; goldsmiths, silversmiths, whitesmiths, clockmakers, carpenters, joiners, weavers, and founders ; in a word, for all the arts and trades that might be turned to account. The Company's lay-brothers of every trade and occupation were, as may be imagined, of immense utility in all her missions abroad. In Paraguay, as soon as the children were old enough to begin to work, they were taken to these workshops, and applied to the business for which they expressed the greatest liking, on the principle, that art is to be guided by nature. Their first masters were Jesuit lay-brothers, sent out on purpose to instruct them. Sometimes the fathers themselves drove the plough, and handled the spade, to teach them agriculture, and engage them, by their example, to cultivate the earth, to sow and to reap. These neophytes built, after designs furnished by the Jesuits, such

churches as would not disgrace the greatest cities in Spain or Peru, either with regard to the beauty of their structure, or the richness and good taste of their sacred vessels and ornaments of every kind.¹

The work of the women was regulated as well as that of the men ; and it consisted chiefly in spinning. At the beginning of the week, each woman received a quantity of wool and cotton, which she had to return on the following Saturday night, ready for the loom. They were occasionally put to such field labour as did not seem to surpass their strength.

No distinctions or inequality were admitted among the people. It was a perfect uniformity of submission and obedience, not interrupted by any of the steps or gradations of other schemes of society. This uniformity and equality would soon have disappeared, had the principle of property been allowed to shoot out according to its natural tendencies : but it was admitted within very narrow limits. The spot of ground attached to every house represented that principle, and, further, something like property might appear in their part of its produce ; but the great bulk of what the labours of the community produced was brought before the Jesuits, and stored in the warehouses. There was a public slaughterhouse for the cattle : the meat was divided into portions, and distributed among the families,—all under the superintendence of the Jesuit-superior. All other necessities were

¹ “In the church of the Franciscans I am informed they have a picture of the Last Supper, painted by an Indian residing at one of the presidencies on the Uruguay, a very capital performance, the frame of which is composed entirely of feathers of a bright gold colour, and so artfully contrived as to appear to the nicest observer some of the most correct carving and gilding ; nor can the difference be discovered until it is touched by the hand. This picture was a present to the Franciscan fathers by the Jesuits, not many years before their expulsion.”—*Davie, Letters from Paraguay*, p. 146.

distributed in like manner. The surplus manufactures, such parts of the produce as fetched great profit in the exportation, as the matte, or herb of Paraguay, were sent to Buenos Ayres, or some other seaport town, and sold by an agent appointed by the missionaries. Out of the proceeds a slight tribute was, in the first place, deducted, which all the Indians above eighteen and under fifty years of age paid to the King of Spain :—the remainder was disposed of for the benefit of the missions, and re-conveyed to them in the form of such European wares as they needed. Ornaments for the churches, and whatever tended to the splendour of public worship and the magnificence of festivals, were regularly procured.

The use of money was rigorously banished from the whole extent of the missions.

In all the distributions attention was paid to the claims of childhood, helplessness, and decrepitude.

The missionaries appear to have been particularly anxious for the accomplishment of two objects. The first was to render their religion and government as striking as possible to the senses of their subjects : hence the regular and elegant structure of their churches, the pomp and solemnity of service, the disposition of the young Indians of both sexes into choirs of music. On festivals all the magistrates appeared in robes of ceremony appropriated to the occasion. The troops made their appearance in their best apparel : fireworks took place, supplied by gunpowder manufactured for the purpose by the Indians themselves : their little artillery was drawn out, and the air resounded with joyful discharges.

One festival in particular deserves description. To inspire the most profound reverence for the sacrament of the altar, a day in the year was set apart devoted to the

special purpose of rendering it distinguished homage. On this day the sacrament was carried in splendid procession through the village. Groups of dancers announced its approach ; nothing burlesque or lascivious was admitted into these dances : but a sort of pure and chaste festivity pervaded the performance. The holy wafer, adorned with everything which their little wealth could afford to render it magnificent, passed over flowers and odoriferous herbs strewed in profusion on the ground, and under boughs and blossoms twisted into triumphal arches. Birds of the gayest plumage, such as expand their wings under those burning suns, were tied to the arches ; but it was so contrived, that the strings which held them should be nicely concealed, so that they seemed to have come of their own accord to mix their warblings with the hymns and canticles of their fellow-mortals, and join in the adoration of one common Deity. This concert of praise and devotion was swelled and deepened by the growlings of lions and tigers, chained at certain distances, in such a manner as to be surveyed without danger by the spectators. Large basons of water were likewise seen, with various fishes of curious forms and dyes, sporting in the rippling waves. The streets were hung with carpets, separated by garlands, festoons, and bundles of foliage, disposed and arranged by the simple taste of the female part of the community.

From this union of art and nature, this display of simplicity and devotion, this concert of the feathered tribes with the savage animals of the desert, this mixture of leaves, flowers, and water, under a serene sky and resplendent sun, arose a scene as smiling to the fancy, and as interesting to the heart, as can be well conceived.

The spectacle concluded, and the different sorts of

provisions, which had been exhibited in the progress of it, were presented by the grateful savages to their spiritual governors, who never failed to send the best part to those whom sickness hindered from partaking in the festivity. The rest were regaled, each with a small cup of wine.

The second object which engaged the attention of the Jesuits, was the exclusion of strangers from the precincts of their dominions. At first, the Spaniards were accustomed to seize all the Indians they met with, carry them into slavery, and employ them in the labour of the mines : the Jesuits obtained an edict from the court of Spain, securing the liberty of all those who joined their communities ; but this did not satisfy them. They would gladly have shut out all Europeans, and prevented their visits, whether as merchants or travellers. This anxiety on their part was represented by their enemies as the jealous vigilance which guards concealed treasures ; but since it has been ascertained that the metallic wealth of those sequestered regions was wholly imaginary, it may be ascribed to a reasonable persuasion, impressed on their minds, that by no other means could the principles of their monastic government be maintained. Accordingly, when a European came among them, he was carefully watched, received with civility and hospitality, but never allowed to wander without the attendance and inspection of some trusty persons, who reconducted him out of the limits of these sacred territories with as little delay as possible.¹

¹ See Charlevoix, *Hist. du Paraguay*, 3 vols. 4to, or the English translation, 2 vols. 8vo. Also Moore's "Lives of Alberoni, Ripperda, and Pombal," an excellent work, pp. 265, *et seq.*; Muratori, *Il Cristianesimo Felice*; and *Litt. Ann.*, ubi *suprà*. Also *Lettres Edif. et Curieuses*; and *Ulloa, Voyage*, ii. c. xv.

A good deal of rhetoric has been lavished on the system of the Paraguay missions. There is a hazy notion lingering in the minds of men that what Fenelon imagined, and Sir Thomas More put forth, or Plato inculcated, was substantially realised by the Jesuits of Paraguay. The pious Christian who read the Annual and the Curious and Edifying Letters, naturally surveyed it with partial fondness:—his heart swelled with joy and delight at the conversion of so many infidel tribes; the whole frame of this religious Society, as represented, was calculated to awaken his sympathy, to excite his praise. That praise came from his heart. Muratori, in his *Christianesimo Felice*, in 1743, showed what effect the annual letters of Father Gaetano Cattaneo produced on his soul of devotion; and though the Jesuits had lashed him severely a short time before, he would prove to them that *his* heart was free from malice; and that in opposing their notions of the “immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary,” and their “sanguinary vow,” he had only stood forth for the truth:—others say that his object was to deprecate their fury,—still there is internal evidence in the book that it was heartily composed from the curious and edifying representations of the Jesuits to which he gave credence.¹ But there were others

¹ “Essendosi trovato il Muratori sul principio dell’ Anno 1742, senza verun argomento per le mani, prese a trattare delle missione de’ Padri Della Comp. di Gesù nel Paraguai, a ciò stimolato da alcune lettere scritte da quelle contrade ne’gli Anni 1729 e 1730, dal P. Gaetano Cattaneo.”—*Vita del Proposto L. A. Muratori dal G. F. S. Muratori suo Nipote*, pp. 64, *et seq.*

Muratori’s nephew does not deny the alleged motive mentioned in the text; but says “it was rather to show the Jesuits and to avow that he was a friend of truth, and honoured it wherever he found it. Nevertheless,” he continues, “I will not conceal the fact that though Muratori made urgent and importunate requests to the chief personages of the Company, whilst engaged in the work, for documents concerning those missions and provinces, he could never obtain anything from them: there was nothing in their archives worthy of seeing the

who, with far different sentiments, pointed complimentally to the Jesuit-kingdom of Paraguay—equivocal Christians—men who hated the Jesuits, who hated Christianity or seemed to do so, but descanting with studied eloquence in praise of the Paraguay missions—Buffon, and his party, with Raynal and Montesquieu, to all whom the Jesuit apologists condescend to appeal for the pittance of praise and seeming approval. But what was the motive? How do *these* approvers aim? Why, this Utopian republic, as represented by the Jesuits, was a “fact” which enabled those sapient pen-holders who stirred humanity, to gratify another of their propensities in declaring against property and the distinction of ranks. The sober and dispassionate reasoner, who is

light! The same treatment he had experienced when he asked for information respecting Father Segneri . . . But when these fathers saw how Muratori had managed and treated their cause, they were not backward in declaring to him their obligations. Their general sent him an ample letter of thanks in the name of the whole Company, and a bull of fraternisation subsequently; Father Lagomarsini dedicated a work to him; and at length the provincial of Paraguay wrote him a letter of thanks. His *Christianesimo Felice* became the condiment of their dinners. The fathers afterwards wished Muratori to undertake the defence of their Malabar missionaries against the work which the famous Father Norbert wrote on the subject; and he was warmly solicited by Father Lagomarsini:—but Muratori could not be induced to enter into such a contest. Subsequently the Jesuits gave him some documents concerning Paraguay, and he published the second part of the *Christianesimo Felice*.”—*Ubi suprà*.

For the disgraceful conduct of the Jesuits towards Muratori, in the matter of the *immaculate conception of the Virgin*, and the *sanguinary vow*, I must refer the curious to his biography, as above, pp. 109—114. Nothing could exceed their violence, setting even the papal mandate at defiance and appealing to the people in the cause of the Virgin, which had enlisted their pride and vanity into a most disgraceful battle of scandal. Muratori honestly denounced the superstitious ceremony and vow which they exhibited and defended, and they fell upon him with injuries, calumnies, in a manner totally unworthy of religious men—but quite in accordance with the *Monita Secreta*. They said he was no theologian—nay, they made out that he was a downright heretic and opposed to the worship of the Virgin. They overwhelmed him with letters full of abuse and menaces, telling him he would not be saved if he did not retract—“*che non si salverebbe se non si ritrattava, e talvolta ancora con minacce*.”—*Ubi suprà*, 120.

anxious to form a right judgment, will calmly inquire into the antecedents and consequents of Jesuit-rule and labour in Paraguay, and what they really accomplished.

Nothing could be more deplorable than the state of things which the Jesuits succeeded in changing for the better, to all intents and purposes, as far as the mere physical or mechanical nature of man is concerned. Whatever miseries a race of wandering savages might endure, were aggravated in a tenfold degree by the tyranny of the Spaniards. Naked, defenceless, they were perpetually the objects of predatory expeditions, and thousands were yearly torn from their native wilds into hopeless captivity. The victims of this remorseless warfare, thus separated from everything that was dear to them, were exercised in the pestilential labours of the mines, condemned to all the drudgery of heartless, ruthless avarice. The Jesuits, who had been the only churchmen that consoled the negro in the Spanish Aceldama, rushed to the rescue of the Indian, as well.¹

¹ The Jesuits state this fact as follows : — “ The African slaves, of whom there is a very great number all over this continent (Anno 1636), since every year many ships full of them come hither from Angola and Guinea, where the natives force each other into slavery, and sell them to the Spanish and Portuguese merchants. They have their sodality in this city as in all others, whereby they are very piously affected. In their bodily ailments and mental sorrows, they have no refuge but our Company.” They were generally re-baptised on their arrival, on account of doubts as to the validity of the sacrament conferred before they were chained by the Christians in the slave-ship.—*Litt. Ann. ut antea*, p. 23. The Jesuit Fauque gives a bitter account of the poor negroes in Cayenne, about a century ago, 1751. They frequently ran away to the woods. “ To obviate this,” says Fauque, “ our kings [of France] in an express code of laws for the slaves, have enacted, that for the first time a slave runs away, if denounced and taken a month after, he shall have his ears cut off and his back branded with the fleur-de-lys. For the second offence, his hamstrings were cut. For the third he was hanged.” The Jesuit gives an account of a feat he performed in inducing a number of negroes to return to their masters

They raised a rampart between the oppressors and the oppressed. The savage was reclaimed from his wandering necessitous life. Peace smiled upon regions which had been the scene of continued murders and strife. Religion raised her temples. Devotion displayed her solemnities. Human nature breathed once more. The arts of civilisation were practised ; and the sweets of society compensated for the bitterness of the past, and made the heart hopeful of the future. Amid forests and solitudes which had resounded only with the yells of barbarous victory and murderous defeat, were heard the canticles of simple devotion, breathed by a decent and orderly array of children, to the sound of instruments harmoniously blending. The den and the cavern were exchanged for more commodious habitations, supplied with every necessary utensil, and many ornamental pieces of furniture, rudely built, of clay and straw, but uniformly covered with tiles. The bloody fur of the wild beast, slain in the chase or adventurous struggle, was replaced by a neat and comely dress. The men wore garments of cloth, and a handsome kind of sandal on their feet, neatly twisted out of a sort of long grass, which grows in those countries. The women, in a loose garment adapted to the heat of the climate, disposed their hair in a number of fanciful fashions,—some allowing it to flow loose over their shoulders, others gathering it in part under a cap ; while strings of black beads, with the cross suspended at the end of

from the woods, on promise of pardon. He succeeded, but with great difficulty, and some remained behind. The government sent a numerous detachment to seize or kill these negroes ; but a disease broke out amongst the troops, and the expedition failed. See the letter, which is worth reading, though full of the usual Jesuit-ostentation, *Miss. D'Amer.* ; *P. Fauque au P. Allart*, 10 Mai, 1751, ii. 51.

them, were thrown round their necks.¹ Such are the probable facts of the fiction.

It is impossible to deny that such change was good. It therefore follows that the Jesuits were entitled to the gratitude of the New World, for extricating the Indians from the murderous passions and policy of the Spaniards and Portuguese. Though we may call the Jesuits to account, on other scores, with regard to *their* policy towards these Indians, that standing fact must be ever admitted,—they left the Indian advanced a step in the scale of beings. But he was stationary there. Thus far, and no farther, was the award. Charlevoix pays the Indians the compliment of ascribing to them unlimited powers of imitation ; but denies them invention. This deficiency was the result of the system that fashioned them unto mere subjection—appealing only to their brute instincts—making them feel that “the fathers were beneficial to them in all their affairs,”—in a word, rigidly fashioning their conduct, in every particular, by the fear of impending punishment, bleak wretchedness once more by expulsion—and, at all times, by the deceitful contrivances of religionism, mocking hell as well as heaven. Never could man’s mind or heart expand to its appointed fulness under the pressure of the Jesuit-institutions, thus applied. They reduced the species to tameness and symmetry ; but what became of its physical, its moral energy ? What became of that internal *power*—the consciousness of duty, eventuating that self-dependance which is neither cast down by failure, nor broken by calamity ? Had these adventurous Jesuits themselves in India, China, and America, everywhere, been hampered

¹ Moore, *ubi supra*, 276, *et seq.* ; Charlevoix, Muratori, and Ulloa, who evidently got his account from the Jesuits.

as they hampered these Indians, the world would have heard little about them. It was partyism, corporate-interests, the cause to which they were sworn, that narrowed the hearts of the Jesuits in its largest conceptions, and made them slaves in the loftiest flights of their independence. Want, calamity, stroke upon stroke by a hostile world inflicted, will neither crush a man nor a nation, if either but feel that self-dependance in any career whatever—but especially when combined with right reason and the heart's uprightness.

Consider the French in their great revolution. A nation hurried by the violence and ferment of the vices which rankled in its bosom, from one kind of fanaticism to another—at all times pouring out its blood at every vein—drunk with the rage of innovation, or mad with the lust of conquest—passing from the desolating despotism of royalty, to the hideous despotism of mobs—then to the headlong, ravaging ambition of an unscrupulous soldier. And yet this nation, amidst all its excesses and disorders, amidst all the causes of destruction and depopulation, perpetually vexing, harassing its heart, lost nothing of its outward greatness ; it was not only secure, but formidable to all its neighbours—until its chieftain blundered and fell back on the hampering antique system, lugging itself along with him—a nation of fiery eagles to feed like vultures on the carrion of the desert. Its thousands had perished on the scaffold, its armies after armies, in victory and death, had left whitening bones 'twixt the tropics, or in the frozen zone, in the north, south, east, and west ; and yet its visible dimensions continued undiminished. It was a giant with decayed vitals—but still a giant.

Compare with such a nation the state of a people,

where every thing is settled and arranged by a cast-iron standard, where luxury and indigence (the thunder and lightning of humanity) are alike unknown ; where a scheme of minute regulations is contrived to mince conscience and exclude opulence, for fear of running into vices which consume the useless ; to strangle indigence, the hungry enemy of increase. What's the result ? Why, this people will never rise above the standard of a languid, sickly body. It is a feeble creeping infant. It expires without a struggle, for it has had nothing to live for,—neither wealth, glory, nor renown,—neither rights achieved, hopes reasonable, nor the spirit-stirring name of Country, which is all.

And the conclusion is this :—Our social institutions are the parents of a family of evils, but they are likewise the parents of our virtues. But what is evil ? How much of selfishness must we not abstract, before we can pronounce that to be evil from which we suffer ? In what period of a man's history did he ever free himself from any given evil, without superinducing the sources of others, perhaps more disastrous ?

Property, the means of security and power, is the invigorating principle of the faculties and exertions of the mass of men. *Property*, in its widest acceptance, as applied to land, tenements, gold, the bodies and souls of our fellow-creatures. Have we not seen how this stimulant to impulse has raised the Jesuits. It has done the same to every nation which has ever “had its day.” But the Jesuits “bled” it out of the Indians, and then they said they mollified their “barbarous minds.” They were extinguished when they were made to feel their utter dependance,—complete subjection.

Man cannot prosper, cannot flourish under the

government of monks. Never will the hero spring up in him who trembles at the frown of a priest. Minute and exact regulations may produce tranquillity and order, but only such as depend upon a hollow system ; and withal stealing away what is necessary to maintain those blessings against external shocks and inroads. The tameness, the benumbed monotony which ever accompany that nature-crushing method, are, in this point of view, more pernicious than the worst vices and abuses arising out of less shackled schemes of policy and social customs. God be thanked, that neither monkhood, nor Jesuit-rule, nor vice is unavoidable by individuals or by nations.¹

By the admission of the Jesuits themselves, their system recoiled on themselves in the reductions. They say that these proselytes were in many respects "children all their lives ;" but it was only so whilst they could shackle them and accustom them to their fetters. By the approach of the *Mamelus*, a tribe of marauders, the whole Reduction of the Incarnation was totally changed at once : they would not hear a word of God, shunned the church, concealed their children, lest they should be baptised, and avoided the Jesuit-superior to the utmost. And what was the cause ? Only a few jugglers who had got into the village, and enticed away the children of the Jesuits, with magical incantations, and carcasses uttering oracles, priests and priestesses. Alas ! even the Jesuits' own *catechists* joined in the fanaticism. It was evidently a rival speculation, and seemed likely to ruin the reduction. The Jesuits set to work furiously ;

¹ In the foregoing remarks I have incorporated, expanded, or elucidated, George Moore's excellent reflections on the Jesuit-system in Paraguay, *ubi supra*, pp. 276—280.

destroyed the temple, and the idols, which were old skeletons dressed in robes and adorned with feathers, and a monstrous dwarf, whom the fathers pulled out of his den, flung him to their children, who passed the poor fellow through an ordeal of gibes and mockery; and then the fathers "instructed" and baptised the monster. Whether this violent remedy cured the disorder is uncertain : Charlevoix does not state the result.¹

On another occasion, the assaults of the Mamelus induced Alfaro, the superior, to undertake a change of locality for the reduction, proposing to move nearer the Uruguay. The neophytes resisted ; they conspired against the missionaries ; the majority resolved to remain. What was done ? Why, Alfaro set fire to the village. Only the crime of arson could achieve an exodus. Forced thus to decamp, these pious items of the *Christianesimo Felice*, divided, took different ways : some went to another tribe ; others were led by the Jesuits to another reduction, where, according to Charlevoix, they did not fare much better.²

Those of St. Anne resumed their inclination for the life of the wilds, imagined that they were gathered as victims for the Mamelus, insulted Alfaro, stormed his chapel, and profaned it before his eyes.³

In 1639 there was a transmigration of a reduction, effected by the skill of the Jesuits, not, however, without the usual demonstrations of mutiny ;⁴ but in 1644, the greatest outrages were inflicted by these happy Christians on their missionary, Father Arenas, whom they wounded in the head. The Jesuits could not get a

¹ Hist. de Paraguay i. p. 383.

² Ib. *ut antea*, p. 437.

³ Ib. *ut antea*, p. 438.

⁴ Ib. *ut antea*, p. 446.

single boy to serve at their mass. The corruption of morals was beyond the hope of reclaiming, when the reduction was saved by a stroke of authority. The Jesuits arrested the cacique, who was ringleader, and probably took effectual means to disqualify him for the future.¹

Those of "The Presentation" had only "promised" to become Christians, we are told, and did not keep their word: they rose tumultuously, reduced the church and house to ashes, forced the Jesuits to take refuge at Santa Cruz. The Reduction of Tarequea had the same issue.²

From these examples it must be evident that the world has been somewhat "deceived by ornament" in the matter of the Jesuit Utopia. Charlevoix let out all these facts and others, by way of showing off the difficulties and harassments of the Jesuits, which all will admit; but it is to be hoped that the following announcement does not mean the penalty of death:—"The missionaries thought it their duty, on certain occasions, to resort to a prudent severity, and not to hesitate to cut off some spoiled members in order to preserve the body."³ Undoubtedly these Jesuits bitterly felt the hardships of their lot; and the dreams they roguishly circulated in Europe may thus be excused, with the "verily, they had their reward." But one of them, at least, Juan Dominguez, an apostle of long standing, was disgusted, pretended to go in quest of timber, in Brazil, got on board a ship ready for sailing,

¹ Charlevoix, ii. 87.

² Ibid. *ut antea*, p. 231.

³ Charlevoix, ii. 263. "Les Missionnaires crurent devoir user en quelques rencontres d'une sage sévérité, et ne point balancer à retrancher quelques membres gâtés, pour conserver le corps."

and returned to Spain. Aquaviva punished him severely.¹

Francia, the modern dictator of the country, in the year 1838, described the Paraguay Jesuits as *unos pillos ladinos*, that is, "refined rogues." This may seem to some of us rather severe; but the following statement is worth attention, as given by Messrs. Robertson, in their interesting "Letters on Paraguay." In their first excursions, the Jesuits fell in with the wandering but peaceful tribes called Guaranis, to whom they began to preach. They set themselves up as the descendants of St. Thomas, whom they represented as the immediate apostle of the Son of God. A name used and venerated by the Indians (as stated by Charlevoix) suggested the fraud. They propagated the imposture; and in a few years they boldly put forth, *as a tradition which they had received from the Indians themselves*, the fact that St. Thomas actually *had* landed in America. He evangelised it, they said, not many years after the apostles had been endowed with power from on high, at Jerusalem. The credulous Indians were flattered and proud of the honour; and the tradition descended with their other legends. Doubtless the reader remembers

¹ Lozano (Jesuit) Hist. de la Comp. de Jesu, in Parag. lib. v. c. 2, 7. A striking illustration of human nature is given by a Jesuit of himself, in the *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*. The reader is probably aware of the superstitious belief respecting *St. Elmo and his lights* held by the sailors of Southern Europe. When electric lights appear, they say that it is St. Elmo, who comes to announce the end of the tempest. The Jesuit Chomé, on his voyage to the missions, where he would have to face death in many shapes for preaching his religion, nevertheless had not the courage to disabuse the sailors of their superstition. "One day, when on deck with the officers, they asked my opinion on the phenomenon. I explained to them its cause; but *I durst not do so in the presence of the sailors*."—*Lett. Edif.* ii. 101 (Panth. Litteraire). Probably the excitements of the mission, like those of battle, made valiant many a heart, otherwise unnerved for the tug of peril. Chomé's letter is dated 26 Sept. 1730.

that precisely the same imposture was put forth by the Jesuits respecting St. Thomas in India; and they subsequently exhibited "St. Thomas's miraculous cross" at Meliapoora, made it change colours during the mass of the Virgin, and then copiously sweat blood whenever they prognosticated calamity.¹ But the inventive Jesuits in America did not stop short with the mere tradition.

¹ See in Kircher's *China Illustrata*, a representation of the said cross, with a Jesuit on one side and two natives on the other, in a posture of adoration. There is no mistaking the invention from the everlasting I. H. S. and the nails on the altar. It is a most elaborate piece of roguish invention, with appropriate "mystic characters" around the cross, duly interpreted "by some Brahmin," and set forth by the original concoctors. Kircher gives the legend, which is much like the Arabian tale of "the Fisherman and the Genius," and says:—"Porro hæc Crux, 18 Decembris, festo scilicet B. Virginis, quod expectationem partus Hispani vocant, quotannis tempore Missæ solennis, in varios colores mutare solet, quin et subindè sanguinem cum sudore copiosissimo emittere; quod tamen semper magnæ calamitatis imminentis prognosticum fuisse experientia docuit," pp. 54, 55. In Kircher's *Mundus Subterraneus*, you will find some curious experiments on the apparent changing of colours. "Thus," says he, "not without the greatest delight you will see, from the combinations of coloured glass, a variety of hues succeeding each other."—Part 3, lib. iv. p. 74.—*Physiol. Kircher.* p. 75. In the present case, the cross is over against a window, whose light was probably the means of producing the phenomenon. At all events, these clever Jesuit-magicians managed the thing to admiration. This cross is of a very dark grey, nearly approaching to black. Now, *somewhere about* the year 1703, say the Curious and Edifying Letters, when the church was full of people, the black cross suddenly, in the sight of all, became red, then brown, and immediately after of a dazzling whiteness: a thick cloud then formed round it, through which occasional glimpses of the cross might be seen, and upon the dispersion of the cloud, the cross was found to be covered with such a profuse perspiration, that the miraculous water flowed as far as the altar. Nay more, whenever this miracle occurs, "on sending to the little Mount also the cross is there found to exhibit," says Father Tachard, "the same miraculous symptoms. Not only was Father Sylvestre de Souza twice an eye-witness of this prodigy, but several English Protestants were present when it occurred, and after a searching investigation were forced to confess that there was something in the matter extraordinary and Divine," t. xii. pp. 19, 20. It is a pity that Father Sylvestre de Souza omits to mention the names of these "Protestants." However, there can be no doubt that the trick was well managed. As Mackay observes, "Rufinus and Socrates, the historians, say that St. Thomas was martyred at Edessa, in Syria; perhaps as the Roman Catholic archbishop of Calcutta is titular archbishop of Edessa, he may be able to decide which of the two is the orthodox tradition."—*Jesuits in India*, p. 12.

They told their credulous converts that the unwieldy cross which their forefathers had seen in the hands of the apostle, was hidden by the unconverted Indians, or Gentiles, in a lake near Chuquisaca,—was there discovered and rescued, at a distance of fifteen centuries of time, by the curate of the place, Padre Sarmiento! “This historical anecdote,” says Mr. Robertson, “is related by Don Pedro Alvear, one of the commissioners of his Catholic Majesty for adjusting the boundary lines between Spanish America and Brazil. The account is taken from a manuscript of his, in the possession of Sir Woodbine Parish. The commissioner is, in many points, a very respectable and accurate historian; but the facility with which he has lent himself to record the pious fictions of the Jesuits, may tend to show the hold they had upon the respect and confidence of even the first men in the country. Alvear seriously solves the problem of the long immersion, without injury, of the miraculous cross, by assuring the reader that it was made of holy wood. He also informs him, that many and stupendous miracles have been performed by means of it.”¹ None of them, however, surpassed those which Ignatius performed there, according to the Jesuits. “It is scarcely possible to tell how many prodigies God has here made our holy father Ignatius illustrious with. A single paper image of him has these last two years performed thirty-five miracles.” All these miracles did the functions of physicians and accoucheurs, as usual—nay, restored sight to the blind.²

¹ Letters on Paraguay, ii. 42—44.

² *Litt. Ann., ut antea*, p. 26. “Dici vix potest quantis prodigiis S. P. N. Ignatium Deus hic illustret. Unica ejus imago papyracea 35 miraculis, hoc biennio fuit insignis; nam et matronarum partus maturati, et uberum dolores depulsi; atque adeò visus est mulieri restitutus,” &c., &c.

But the most curious prodigy was that a young woman was enabled to resist

“The footing which, by pious fraud, the Jesuits obtained in the country, they confirmed by a combination of wisdom and worldly tactics seldom united in other mortals. They worked so effectually, that in about fifty years from the time of their first landing on the coast of Brazil, they had not only erected colleges and *casas de residencia* (habitations for themselves) at most of the principal Spanish stations in South America, but had fortified themselves by thirty establishments of their own, containing 100,000 inhabitants, on the banks of the Paraná and Uruguay. Their vast estates constituted the finest part of the territory of the whole of this section of South America.

“From this centre of operations, they extended their influence far and wide. Their *casas de temporalidades* (or buildings for their warehouses), occupied in Buenos Ayres, together with their college and other buildings, a whole quadra (one hundred and forty-four yards square) of land. So fearful were those cautious and prudent men of anything—even of the lightning of Heaven — touching their *temporalidades* (goods and chattels), that the whole of their offices and warehouses were made bomb-proof. They were secured by massive iron gratings ; and built in a style of solidity, capaciousness, and splendour, to which there was no parallel in the country.

“I once occupied a wing of this *temporalidades*-

the violence of a criminal assault, by having an image of the Virgin on her breast. One would suppose that this “fact” was enough ; not so, however. The picture got torn in the struggle : the girl was sorely afflicted thereat ; she put the pieces in a box, and when she went to it again, she found it completely restored to its original condition.”—*Ubi suprâ*, p. 27. The Lettres Edif. and Charlevoix furnish similar miracles : but I fear we have been already sufficiently disgusted with the impious inventions, fictions, and contrivances.

building for twelve months," continues Mr. Robertson. "While I lived there, in 1811, the town of Buenos Ayres was bombarded by the Spanish marines from Montevideo; and as the bombs and shells fell fast and thick in all parts of the town, many of the people, and especially of my own friends, sought shelter under the bomb-proof roofs of the former abode of the Jesuits. There they slept for three or four successive nights; and so secure did they feel in the strongly-vaulted apartments, that they danced and made merry, whilst the marines, from their shipping in the inner roads, were throwing their shot and shells into the town.

"The traffic of the Jesuits with Buenos Ayres, Assumption, and Corrientes, was very great. Affecting to govern all their establishments on the principle of a community of goods, and having persuaded the Indians that they participated equally with their pastors in the advantages derived from their labour in common, the Jesuits made subservient to their own aggrandisement, the toil of a hundred thousand Indian slaves. They instructed them in agriculture, and in the mechanical arts; they made of them soldiers and sailors; and they taught them to herd cattle, prepare *yerba*, and manufacture sugar and cigars. But while the churches and *casas de residencia* were built with elaborate splendour, the Indian architect and mason occupied mud-hovels. While the padres had all the conveniences, and even luxuries, that could be furnished by the carpenter and upholsterer; and while the churches exhibited fine specimens of architecture, carving, and embroidery, the Indian workman had scarcely a table and a chair, very seldom a bed, and never any other hanging or coverlet, in his hovel, than a coarse poncho. The Indians *made*

shoes, but the padres alone *wore* them, and exported the surplus. Plenty of sugar, maté, cigars, sweetmeats, and Indian corn, were annually sent to Buenos Ayres ; but the poor Indian could with difficulty get a meagre supply of salt to his yucca-root, and to his occasional meal of beef. The soldiers were without pay, and the sailors without reward. The barks constructed by one class of missionary subjects were first employed in carrying away the articles produced by the sweat of the brow of another, and then in bringing back, as a return, finery for the churches, and luxuries for the padres and their friends. It is true that the Indian was fed and clothed out of the common stock of produce, but so scantily and disproportionately, that while his earnings might amount to a hundred dollars (20*l.*) a year, his food and raiment never cost one half of the sum. He was allowed two days in the week—latterly three—on which to cultivate a small patch of ground for himself ; but whatever this produced went in diminution of the supplies issued to him from the public stores. So that, after all, it came to the same thing. The ‘community’ (that is, of the padres) was still the gainer by the personal labour of the Indian. Public expenditure was diminished by his individual labour on his own account ; and while the padres claimed and received great credit for this liberal extension of time to the Indian for his own benefit, they knew that their practical sophistry went still in support of their fundamental principle—aggrandisement of the body. It is from innumerable acts of this kind—specious ostensibly, but altogether cunning and selfish in reality—that the phrase ‘Jesuitical fellow’ has become a designation of no very honourable import.”¹

¹ Robertson, *Letters on Paraguay*, ii. 43—48.

This account does not materially undermine the credit due to the Jesuits for their exertions in Paraguay, though it tends to qualify that unblushing self-applause which the Jesuits and their friends claim for the missions. Various writings appeared against the Jesuit kingdom of Paraguay, and apologies met them vigorously, as usual. In the very worst that can be said against the Jesuits—namely, that they made use of the Indians for their own aggrandisement and enrichment, in return for their protection and support, I think them, as men, perfectly excusable, like all our manufacturers, if the latter strive to deserve the following description, as applied to the Jesuit-Indians about forty years after the expulsion of the Jesuits :—“ They are straight and well-shaped, with lively, animated features ; and no more like the poor Indians I saw at Buenos Ayres than, as Hamlet says, ‘ Hyperion to a satyr,’ so effectually does slavery, sorrow, and ill-usage destroy the finer fabric of man. These here look healthy, cheerful, and perfectly content ; those of Buenos Ayres, miserable squalid objects ; many of them maimed, from the hardships they endure, and all apparently praying for the hour that shall close their lives and miseries for ever. Here they are neatly clothed, plentifully fed, and comfortably lodged ; nor is there such a thing as a cripple to be seen among them : there they have scarcely a rag to wrap round them, or a hovel to shelter them from the fury of the elements : they partake of nothing but the meanest of victuals ; and if they are sick no one thinks it worth his while to trouble his head about them, but they are left to survive or perish as God shall please to appoint ; what a contrast, my friend, is here ! Could we be surprised if the flames of rebellion should, ere long, burst forth and overwhelm

the treacherous and unsuspecting Spaniards? * * * I could say much on this subject, and I could prophecy events in times not far distant; but in my present situation silence best becomes me. All appears quiet now: but I fear, nay I am certain, it is but a deceitful calm that precedes a dreadful storm, which will, when least expected, break in fatal thunder upon the heads of the proud oppressors. Human patience, in every state of life, may be stretched to its utmost limits, and yet forbear to turn; but let that limit once be passed, and woe to the tyrant who has tried how far he might injure with impunity.”¹

All the world knows that retribution came upon the Spaniards, as well as the Jesuits, on other scores if not for Paraguay, as we shall presently witness.

That among their devotees in Europe the strongest favourable impressions were made by the Jesuits, may be gathered from the following extract. It occurs in a letter written by the Jesuit D'Etré to another Jesuit—at all events such is the superscription given to the “edifying and curious letter:” “You see, reverend father, that in the midst of so many barbarous nations, we must always have our souls in our hands. Many of our missionaries have had the happiness to be sacrificed to the fury of these infidels, and to seal with their blood the truths which they announce,—among the rest,

¹ Davie, *Letters from Paraguay*, pp. 215, *et seq.* The best hostile account of the Jesuits in Paraguay was published in 1770 by an ex-Jesuit, Ibaguez, under the title of “*The Jesuit-Kingdom in Paraguay*.” It is certainly well written, and makes out a strong case against the Company. I am unable to give the precise Italian or Spanish title of the book, not having seen either: but that of the German translation is: “*Jesuitisches Reich in Paragay durch Originaldocumente der Gesellschaft Jesu bewiesen, von dem aus dem Jesuiterorden verstossenen Pater Ibanez.*” Cölln, 1774.

Father Francis de Figueroa, in 1666 ; Father Peter Suarez in 1667 ; Father Augustin de Hurtado in 1677 ; Father Henry Richler in 1695 ; and, in 1707, Father Nicholas Durango. Besides the perils to which we are exposed with a people so brutal and cruel, what have we not to fear in the frequent voyages which we are obliged to make ! Continually, and almost at every step, we run the risk of being torn to pieces by the tigers, or bitten by vipers, or crushed beneath those huge trees which often fall when we are least thinking of them, or of being carried away and drowned in very rapid rivers, or swallowed by the crocodiles, or else by frightful serpents which, *with their pestiferous breath, stop passengers*, dash upon them and devour them. I have often been in similar perils, but I have been always preserved by a special protection of Divine Providence. One day these barbarians poisoned my drink and the meats of my table, without my having ever felt the least inconvenience. Another time, being among the Omaguas, about midnight, they set fire to my hut, which was covered with leaves, and where I was sleeping tranquilly :—I happily escaped from the midst of the flames with which I was suddenly surrounded. It happened another day, that after having built a new church among the Chayabitas, a Spaniard who was three paces from me, firing a musket in token of rejoicing, the barrel of his musket burst, a piece struck me on the left eye, and *fell flattened at my feet, without doing me the least harm*. I could relate to you a great number of similar examples, did I not fear to overstep the limits of a letter.”¹ Thus talked the Jesuits in 1731. Arrant fustian as it is, there were devotees to believe them ; and

¹ Lettres Edif. Miss. d'Amérique, ii. 117 (Panth. Litt.)

yet, how ridiculous is the apostle made to appear, now that we calmly read the everlasting monument of infatuation ; or, if the man actually wrote the account of his sacred person, under a special providence, what a state of “spiritual pride,” as the ascetics call it, is therein exhibited !

In Madura, Nobili’s scheme was prosecuted with vigour, in the rage for proselytes. Nobili died in 1656, aged 72 years ;—he had been a Jesuit-Saniassi forty-five years, and, according to the Jesuits, “he had converted 100,000 idolaters.”¹ He died quietly at Meliapoora, whither he had retired for rest from his incalculable toils—decidedly one of the most remarkable members of the human family—a perfect example of complete devotedness to a strong idea.

The Jesuit John de Britto followed his example, nay, surpassed his model. He became a Saniassi, and “baptised in the kingdom of Marava, 30,000 pagans” in the twenty years of his apostolate.² Three years after, the famous Jesuit Beschi eclipsed all his predecessors. On the first day of his arrival in India, in 1700, he engaged two Brahmins as his servants, and assumed the pagan penitential garb. It is minutely described, in all its gorgeous magnificence, by the Jesuit-biographer ; and enhanced that of his predecessors by the pearls or red stones which adorned

¹ Cahours, ii. 166. The Jesuit Cahours palms this “fact” on Dubois, referring to his “Description of India :”—but there is no such fact there. It may be in the French edition, among “notes :” but this should have been stated. Dubois in his “Letters,” p. 7, says that “It appears from authentic lists, made up about 70 years ago, which I have seen, that the number of Christians in these countries was as follows : in the Marava about 30,000, in the Madura above 100,000,” &c. It is to *Jesuit*-lists that Dubois alludes, as he is speaking of their Brahmin-career.

² Cahours, ii. 166.

his ears. He wore a ring composed of five metals, Turkish slippers on his feet, and he carried a long cane. He sat in a palanquin, on a tiger-skin remarkable for its beauty. Two men, one on each side, shook over him magnificent fans of peacocks' feathers ; and they carried before him a silk umbrella tipped with a golden ball. Such was the great *Viramamouni's* mode of travelling ; and such the name substituted for Padre Beschi of the Company of Jesus. If he ever stopped in any place, he always sat on a tiger's skin, after the Brahminic ritual. What a prodigy of learning the Jesuits represent him ! Besides Italian, his native tongue, he had mastered Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Portuguese, and several other languages. In India he learnt the Sanscrit, the Telenga, and the Tamul. He read all the works of the native poets ; and composed, in the languages which he had acquired, works which are compared to a "mountain of gold, which, reflecting the rays of the sun, scatter afar torrents of light."¹

The Christian subjects he selected for the themes of his genius were well adapted for pagan expansion. In honour of St. Joseph, "the nurse of the Incarnate Saviour," he composed 3615 strophes, divided into 36 cantos, under the general title of Tembavani, which is, being interpreted, "Nourish thou thyself with milk and honey." At the request of the learned, who could not cap the sublimity of his poesy, he transferred the work into prose. The "Sufferings of Christ," the "Virginity of Mary," the "Immaculate Conception of the Virgin," successively became involved in his Brahminic scheme to mystify the natives. Five scribes he constantly retained. When under inspiration, he poured forth the winged

¹ Cahours, ii. 170 *et seq.*

words, and the first scribe wrote the first part of the quatrain, the second put down the second, and so on to the fifth, who put the whole in order. One scribe would not have sufficed for the rapidity of his conception, says the Jesuit.¹

The wonders related of this man by the infatuated Jesuits are not yet exhausted. Viramamouni wished to pay a visit to a nabob. Persian was necessary :—he mastered the language in three months, and Turkish into the bargain ! Most satisfactory was the interview. The nabob was charmed with his genius ; gave him a new name, and his own grandfather's palanquin. Nay more, like the patron of Themistocles of old, he assigned Viramamouni *four provinces* for his maintenance, with a revenue of twelve hundred rupees *per annum*, and appointed him his dewân, or prime-minister. Then might he be seen with “an escort of thirty horsemen on every occasion, with twelve standard-bearers, and four attendants, with silver staves. He was mounted on a magnificent white horse, or a black one, richly caparisoned. Behind him went a trumpeter on horseback ; a camel laden with enormous cymbals, another camel carrying a huge drum, which resounded afar ;—on another were ornaments necessary to celebrate the mass ; and three other camels carried his baggage and his tents.”² Mass, indeed ! Is it possible to make us believe that this man, who so thoroughly conformed to the manners, thoughts, sentiments, expression of the pagan priests or sages, would dare to exhibit the contemptible paraphernalia of the Feringees, hoisting them on a camel ? Is it reasonable to expect us to believe anything of the sort ?

¹ Cahours, ii. 172.

² *Ib. ut antèd*, 173.

The pandaroms, or penitents, of the country came to confound this new wonder of the world. It was a battle of *enigmas*. One of them held up two fingers. Viramamouni at once gave the numerous significations of the symbol, to their utter confusion, which he enhanced by holding up *one* finger—for which they found no signification, because he telegraphed thereby “one only God, creator of all things,” &c. Nine other pandaroms, wearing long hair, great sages in their way, challenged him to a disputation. Like the conditions between Ignatius and the doctor of old, the vanquished was to submit to the law of the conqueror. Viramamouni took them in hand: the contest lasted a month: they were beaten. Six were tinged with the sacred waters, and three of them were deprived of their protracted locks—for all surrendered at discretion. The last went into exile, but their locks, five or six feet long, were hung up in the vestibule of Viramamouni’s temple at Tirouca-valour.¹ Beschi, *alias* Viramamouni, as above, died in 1742, and became, according to the modern Jesuit Cahours, “a new ornament of heaven.”²

To keep up the astounding imposture, a Jesuit wrote Beschi’s biography in *Tamul*, which was translated by the Jesuit De Ranquet, who died in 1843.³ Nor was that all by an immensity. The Brahmins have four sacred books, called Vedas, which are supposed by them to have been revealed by God. The Jesuits of Madura forged a fifth veda, and pretended that it was revealed to the chief Brahmin of the pagoda of Cheringham, by the God of the other four. So artfully did they imitate the style of the genuine vedas, that their forgery imposed even on some Brahmins, and for many years it was received as

¹ Cahours, ii. 174, *et seq.*

² Ib. ii. 175.

³ Ib. *ubi supra*, 169.

authentic. Voltaire was induced to publish a French translation of the imposture, under the name of *L'Ezour-Vedam, ou Ancien Commentaire de Vedam*.¹ In one of Voltaire's dialogues, a mandarin says to a Jesuit—"You seem to make so much of imposture, that perhaps I would excuse it in you, if it could be eventually useful to mankind :—but I firmly believe that there is no case in which falsehood can be of service to truth."²

It was something glorious in itself to play the honourable Saniassi—to rise above those who deemed themselves the wisest in the land. It was a delightful thing to see the increasing results of the wonderful scheme—nothing less than a *new* religion to the world, beautifully but unintelligibly concocted out of the strange doings of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, and Roman mysteries, or Bible-allegories, as far as it was safe to admit them, by dint of stirring, calcining, sublimating, until went forth the new *Higuiero d'Inferno*, or compound Catholicon.

¹ The Rev. James Hough, in his defence of the Protestant missions against Dr. Wiseman's very indelicate pulpit-diatribes against the same, thus remarks on this forgery : "The imposture was detected, about twenty years ago, by the late Mr. Ellis, a gentleman of the civil service at Madras . . . Few European gentlemen have been better acquainted with the science and customs, the laws and theology of the Hindoos, than Mr. Ellis ; and, after a careful comparison of this *Ezour-Vedam* with the Hindoo Vedas, he pronounced it a 'literary forgery, or rather as the object of the author or authors was not literary distinction, of religious imposition without parallel.'" Mr. Ellis's Dissertation is published in the Asiatic Researches, vol. xiv. Father Calmette lets out the following piece of religious roguery. "Since there have been missionaries in India, it was never thought possible to get at that book [the Vedam] so much respected by the Indians. In effect we would never have succeeded, if we had not had Christian Brahmins concealed among them. For how would they have communicated it to Europe, and particularly to the enemies of their worship, since, with the exception of their own caste, they do not impart it even to India?" The same Jesuit asserts the general inability of the Brahmins to read the Vedam—a fact which must have emboldened the Jesuits to forge a new one.—See *Lettr. Edif. ; Miss. de L'Inde (Panth. Litt.)* ii. 611, 621. See also Mackay, *ubi suprâ*, p. 45.

² Volt. Dial. xii. *Un Mandarin et un Jésuite*.

It was still the rage of conquest, still the rage of domination ;—only the means were altered, and, to all intents and purposes, less disastrous to humanity, because all the evil was on the side, or, rather, the head, of the Jesuits, and the scheme would necessarily betray and defeat itself after a few years of unenviable triumphs.

And they turned Pariahs as well :—whilst the Jesuit-Saniassis rigidly conformed to the Brahminic law of exclusion, and would hold no communication with the caste, or rather out-caste, of the Pariahs, the Jesuits Emmanuel Lopez, Acosta, and many others, shrank and sank to the revolting degradation, and became—so as to complete the universal scheme—Jesuit-Pariahs. “What a comical sight it was,” says a traveller, “to see two brothers, members of the same Order, two friends, and yet, wherever they happened to meet, unable to eat together, nor lodge in the same house, not even to speak to each other ! One was arrayed in splendid costume like a great lord ; he was mounted on a costly steed, or was pompously borne in a palanquin ; whilst the other was a half-naked vagrant, covered with rags, on foot, and surrounded with beggars, whose accoutrement was still more wretched than his own. The missionary of the nobles stalked with head erect, and deigned to salute nobody. The poor gourou of the Pariahs from a distance saluted his approaching brother, laid himself prostrate as he passed, and placed his hand on his mouth, in order that his breath might not infect the doctor of the nobles. The latter eat only rice prepared by Brahmins ; and the former fed on some cast-away piece of putrid flesh—the fare of his companions.”¹

¹ Perrin, *Voyage dans l'Indostan*, ii. 106, 107.

Such was the state of matters in Madura,—“in my opinion, the finest mission in the world,” writes Father Martin, in a Curious and Edifying Letter, in the year of our Lord 1699. In a single year Father Bouchet baptised 2000 pagans ; and in a single day he administered the rite to 300, “so that his arm fell powerless with fatigue.” “Moreover,” said Bouchet, “these are not Christians like those in other parts of India. We don’t baptise them without great probation, and three or four months’ instruction. And when they are once Christians, they live like angels, and the church of Madura seems a true image of the primitive church.” Bouchet protested that he sometimes heard the confessions of many entire villages, without finding a single person guilty of one mortal sin. “Don’t fancy,” said he, “that it is ignorance or shame which hinders them from opening their conscience at the sacred tribunal : they approach it as well instructed as monks or Jesuits (*religieux*), and with the candour and simplicity of a novice.” What was the number of souls on his hands or his head ? *Trente mille*—30,000 !¹ Only eight days together could he remain in any one place ; but ten or twelve native catechists went before these missionary Saniassis, to prepare the way at their approach ; and thus their labours were lightened ere they administered the “Christian” rites, with knotted staff in hand, and besmeared with the purifying cow’s dung—these “Brahmins from the north.” Wonderful are the tales recorded of this curious and edifying mission. It was not only filled with angels, but devils in abundance. “Some find themselves transported in an instant of time from one place to another—from their own village,

¹ Lett. Edif. t. x. 41—43.

for instance, to some distant forest or unknown pathway. Others lie down at night in perfect health, and awake next morning with their bodies all bruised with blows which they have received [from the devils], and which have forced them to utter fearful cries during the night. The devil frequently appears to the catechumens under a hideous form, and reproaches them, in the most cutting terms, for abandoning the gods adored in the country. I have baptised a Hindoo," says Bouchet, "who was carried all at once from the path which led to the church to another, where he saw the devil holding in his hand a scourge, or cow-hide (*nerf de bœuf*), with which he threatened to beat him if he did not give up his resolution to meet me there."¹

"A short time ago," says Jesuit Le Gac, writing to the governor of Pondicherry, "a heathen, who has Christian relatives, and who is only waiting for the conclusion of a *marriage* to follow their example, sitting one evening at his house-door, in the moonlight, saw a man in appearance like one of their false gods, who came and sat beside him. He held in one hand a trident, and in the other a small bell, with an empty gourd, which is used in asking alms. The spectre frowned upon him with a threatening glance; but the proselyte, who had heard something of the virtue of the sign of the cross, made that adorable sign, and the spectre disappeared."²

Amongst their numerous discoveries or verifications, we are indebted to the Jesuits for the attestation of a popular notion which the learned have considered ridiculously apocryphal. In Cochin China the Jesuits went forth in pursuit of the devil on one occasion, when

¹ Lett. Edif. xiii. 65.

² Ibid. xiii. 154.

roused by the alarm from the natives that the devil had appeared. "Recommending ourselves to God, arming ourselves with crosses, *Agnus Deis*, and relics, two of us advanced to the spot where the devil was ; and we got so near, that we had only to turn a corner, and would have fallen in with him, when he vanished in a twinkling, leaving, well imprinted on the pavement, three traces, or footmarks, which *I saw* ; they were more than two palms in length, with the impression of *the claws and spurs of a cock*. Some ascribed this flight of the devil to the virtue of the holy cross and the relics which we had about us."¹

And like Father Cotton with the French devil in the nun, Father Bernard de Sa had an edifying and curious dialogue with a Hindoo devil in Madura. "The heathens brought to him a Hindoo cruelly tormented by the devil. The father interrogated him in the presence of a great number of idolaters, and his answers very much surprised the spectators. He first asked him, where were the gods, whom the Hindoos adored ? The answer was, they were in hell, where they suffered horrible torments." [*Stocks and stones and mere mental imaginings* "suffering horrible torments in hell"! See how inconsiderate were these cunning Jesuits after all!] "And what becomes of those, pursued the father, who adore these false divinities ? They go to hell, was the

¹ Relatione della nuova missione, &c. al Regno della Cocincina. Scritta dal Padre C. Borri della medesima Compagnia, 1631, pp. 215, *et seq.* "Racomandatoci noi prima à Dio, armati di Croci, Agnus Dei, e reliquie, andammo due Padri à quel luogo dove era il Demonio, ed arrivammo tanto vicini, che solo mancava voltare una cantonata per imbatterci in lui, quando in un tratto disparve lasciando bene impresse nel pavimento tre orme, ò pedate, le quali io viddi, lunghe più di due palmi, con li segni dell' unghie, e sproni del gallo. Attribuirono alcuni questa fuggita del Demonio alla virtù della santa Croce, e reliquie, che con esso noi portavamo."

answer, there to burn with the false gods whom they have adored. Lastly, the father demanded of him, Which was the true religion? and the devil answered from the mouth of the possessed, that there was none true except that which was taught by the missionary, and that it alone led to heaven.”¹

Woe to the heretic that might chance to be present during those formidable exorcisms! Father Calmette tells of a Lutheran convert and his wife, who happened to be in Tanjore, when a *heathen* exorcism was performing; and while they were incautiously looking on, the devil, vacating the person possessed, entered into the female heretic. The exorcist, being much surprised, asked the devil the meaning of this: “The reason is,” answered he, “that she is my property, just as much as the other.” The terrified husband brought his wife to the Roman Catholic Church at Elacourichi, and there, having asked pardon of God, he took a little earth, which he first moistened with his tears, and putting it on his wife’s head with lively faith, she was instantly dispossessed. This fact, adds Father Calmette, is public and unquestionable—*c’est un fait public et constant!*² In effect, the missionaries used to say that “*the devil is the best catechist in the mission*”!³

The same veracious Chronicle, so curious and edifying, affirms a most desirable charity in *wild beasts*, as well as evangelism in devils. In a letter to an *Ursuline* nun at Toulouse, Father Saignes says: “My church is built at the foot of a high chain of mountains, from which

¹ Lett. Edif. xiii. 67.

² Lett. Edif. xiii. 360.

³ Lett. Edif. xiii. 64. “C’est aussi ce qui fait dire aux missionnaires que le démon est le meilleur catéchiste de la mission, parcequ’il force pour ainsi dire plusieurs idolâtres de se convertir, forcé lui-même par la toute-puissance de celui à qui tout est soumis.”

the tigers formerly came down in great numbers, and devoured many men and cattle. But since we have built a church there to the true God, they are no longer to be seen ; and this is a remark, which has been made by the infidels themselves.”¹ “ We were travelling,” says Father Tremblay, “ about ten o’clock at night, and were occupied, according to the custom of the mission, in telling our beads, when a large tiger appeared in the middle of the road, so near me, that I could have touched him with my staff. The four Christians, who accompanied me, terrified by the sight of the danger, cried out, *Sancta Maria !* Forthwith the terrible animal moved a little out of our path, and showed, so to speak, by his posture, and by the grinding of his teeth, how sorry he was to let such a fine prey escape.”² And Father Martin makes the tigers as unfair and partial as the Inquisition. “ It has been commonly observed,” says he, “ that when heathens and Christians happen to be in company together, the tigers devour the former without doing any harm to the faithful,—these last finding armour of proof in the sign of the cross, and in the holy name of Jesus and Mary ; which, the heathens observing with admiration, they also have begun to make use of the same arms to avoid the fury of the tigers, and to preserve themselves from danger.”³

This is, indeed, wonderful invention touching the powers of the holy cross ; but the mission miracles, as usual, exhibit the extraordinary extent to which the Jesuits believed they could stretch devotional credulity. I fear I have already almost utterly exhausted the reader’s patience by the details on Jesuit prodigies ; but a few more must be given to complete the subject.

¹ Lett. Edif. xiv. 12.

² Ibid. xiv. 212.

³ Ibid. x. 110.

Where, in fact, should we look for miracles, if not in this wonder-land of Madura? A bare enumeration of them would fill many pages. At Cotate, or Kotar, in the south, near Cape Comorin, there was a church built over the spot where Xavier is said to have been miraculously preserved from flames. In it the Christians had erected a large cross, which speedily became famous even among the “idolaters, by a very great number of miracles.” Formerly, *water* was burnt instead of oil, in the lamps suspended before the image of the saint. This was only an imitation; for Eusebius, the antique historian, tells of a similar pious fabrication, ascribed to Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, who changed water into the “fatness of oil.” This is one of the worst features in the Jesuits:—all that ever was vile, ridiculous, absurd, mendacious, they shamelessly imitated, and forced down the throats of their miserable, pitiable devotees in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. Xavier continued to work miracles in the church of Cotate *every day*,¹ and in the South he performed so many prodigies for the idolaters, that there was great danger of their worshipping him as a god. “They look upon him,” says Jesuit Martin, “as the greatest man who has appeared in these last times:”—and well they might, with such eternal rogueries with which the Jesuits sought to exalt themselves in the name of the simple enthusiast. “They call him *Peria Padriar*—that is, the great *Padre*—and there are even grounds to fear that they may rank him among their false divinities, notwithstanding the care we take in informing them of the kind of worship which is really his due. Nevertheless, they

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 85.

remain at ease in their errors ; and when we press them, they content themselves with answering coldly, that they cannot abandon their own religion, to embrace that of a caste so base and despicable as that of the Feringees.”¹ Unquestionably, they had good grounds for their opinion.

But the Jesuits made it appear that Xavier did not trouble himself much about conversions, provided they received pecuniary contributions to his church,—for he did not work miracles *gratis*, any more than his brethren taught on the same terms : in fact, the Jesuits made the mission, as every thing else they took in hand, a source of emolument—a bank of gold *Ad majorem Dei gloriam* :—though it must be confessed that, on most occasions, they worked harder for their pay than any others embarked in similar “religious” avocations, either before their time or since. An idolater had a favourite child, who, from some disease of the eyes, was threatened with blindness. The miserable parent had recourse to the saint, and vowed to present eight fanams to his church at Cotate, if the cure of his son was effected. The child was cured accordingly ; and the father brought him to the church and presented him to the saint ; but instead of giving eight fanams, as he had promised, he offered only five. The saint, however, was not to be so easily cheated : for before the heathen had well got to the church door, he found his son’s eyes much worse than they were at first. Struck with terror, the father hastened back, prostrated himself before the altar, publicly avowed his fault, paid up the three fanams, and rubbed some oil from one of the lamps, on his child’s eyes. On leaving the church, he

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 86.

found once more that his son was perfectly cured!¹ There are two or three exceptional and remarkable points in this miracle—one of them pointing to the systematic roguery of the Jesuits, in making their skill in medicine the means of “practising” on the poor pagans in more ways than one: but I will leave the matter to the reader, and pass on to another curious method for raising funds.

Xavier was a patron of *lotteries*. It is curious to find this contrivance amongst the early Jesuit-pagans of the Edifying Letters. A number of Hindoos, from 500 to 1,000, associated for this purpose:—each put a fanam every month into a common purse, until a considerable sum was collected: then each wrote his name on a separate slip, and put it into a common receptacle. The vessel was well shaken, and a little child, putting his hand into it, drew out a name. The person whose name was first drawn forth, was the successful candidate, and received the whole sum. “By this means,” says Jesuit Martin, “which is very innocent, persons who had been very poor, became suddenly well off, and remained comfortable ever after.” Now it seems that a covetous heathen had embarked in two of these lotteries, and being anxious for success in *both*, bethought himself of St. Francis Xavier, the *Peria Padriar*, or miracle-machine of the Jesuits. He went to Cotate, and in the church promised the saint five fanams, provided he favoured him in the drawing of the first lottery. He loudly proclaimed what he had done;

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 86. We are, however, expressly told that this cure effected by the Jesuit-surgeon, made no further impression on the pagans: “neither the father nor any one of that prodigious multitude of pagans, who could not deny a fact so striking and public, ever thought of becoming a Christian.”—*Ibid.*

they laughed at his bargain with the saint ; but their surprise was great when they saw his name come forth with the prize. Thereupon he paid the five fanams to the Jesuits ; and again offered, if he were successful in the second lottery, to pay the saint double the former perquisite. And now he boldly displayed his confidence of success, and took bets to a large amount—yea, “he employed in these bets all the first sum he had gained.” He won the prize, and paid even more than the ten fanams he had promised.¹ What a strange fact for the Jesuits to put forth—and what a despicable opinion must be entertained of those who were edified by such occurrences. Thereupon the fathers urged the heathen to turn Christian. “No answer, nor conversion !” says Jesuit Martin. The pagans would not condescend to receive the faith from the lips of the abominated Feringees :—for this is the famous letter in which Father Martin makes every effort to prove, that the Brahminic scheme of the Company was indispensable—since even her miracles had failed to make converts.

There was danger lest Xavier should be numbered among the Hindoo deities,—as Father Martin declares, immediately adding a fact, which occurred “almost at the same time.” It is well known that there are women attached to the heathen temples. They are called the *slaves* of the god. What these are, and the purpose for which they are kept, need not be stated :—nor is it necessary to remark that a Christian church should not have exhibited the same custom, though the worst features of the abomination may have been absent. Yet Xavier had his female *slaves*, and they were sold by public auction for the benefit of the mission-treasury

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 90, *et seq.*

—the proceeds being “ordinarily employed in maintaining orphans or feeding poor pilgrims who visited the shrine of the saint.” Much as this fact may seem to be a “calumny,” it is, nevertheless, in the Curious and Edifying Letters :—

“They bring their children to the church at a certain age, and there publicly declare them to be *the slaves of the saint*, by whose intercession they have received life, or have been preserved from death. After which the people assemble ; the child is put up for sale as a slave, and the parents receive her back, by paying *to the church*, the price offered *by the highest bidder*.”¹ An instance is then given of “a Christian woman who, having had a daughter in the very year when she made her vow, reared her up with great care for three years, in order that the price which might be offered for her should be more considerable, and that thus her offering should be greater. And then she came and presented her to the church, according to custom.”² What happens when the parents are not able to raise the money, is shrouded in judicious darkness.

Strange that these facts could edify the Christians of Europe. Still they were boldly put forth—the pagan-christianism of the Jesuits was boastfully exhibited. “The missionaries,” says Father Tachard, “had resolved to assume the dress and the manner of living of

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 89. “On les amène à l’église à un certain âge et on les déclare publiquement pour esclaves du saint, par l’intercession de qui ils ont reçu la vie ou ils ont été préservés de la mort ; après quoi le peuple s’assemble, l’enfant est mis à l’enchère comme un esclave, et les parens le retirent en payant à l’Eglise le prix qu’en a offert le plus haut enchérisseur.”

² Lett. Edif. x. 89. “La femme Chrétienne dont je parle, ayant eu une fille l’année même qu’elle fit son vœu, elle l’éleva avec un grand soin pendant trois ans, afin que le prix qu’on offrirait fût plus considerable et qu’ainsi son affrande fût plus forte. Elle vint ensuite selon la coutume, la présenter à l’église.”

Brahminical *Saniassis*, that is, of religious penitents. This was a very difficult undertaking, and nothing less than apostolic zeal and love could have enabled them to sustain its hardships and austerities. For, besides abstinence from every thing that has life, flesh, fish, and eggs, the Saniassis have other observances extremely painful. They must bathe every morning in a public tank, in all weathers, and do the same before every meal, of which there is but one a day I do not here speak of other rules as irksome as the former, which a missionary Saniassi must keep inviolably, if he wishes to derive any advantage from his labours for the salvation of the poor Indians.”¹ The eighteen different modes of doing penance, which, as a Saniassi, the missionary would have to perform, are doubtless here alluded to :— I have detailed many, in my first volume, when treating of Ignatius at Manreza. Father De Bourges writes to the Countess de Sonde in 1713, inclosing a portrait of a Missionary Saniassi, with his orange dress, his knotted staff, his copper vessel, long beard, and sandals, very edifying, and very nicely engraved in the *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses* : “ You see,” he says, “ you see at once, what kind of dress the missionaries wear : it is of common cotton cloth, neither red, nor yellow, but of a colour betwixt both. The vessel which they carry in their hand is of copper : and as water is not to be found everywhere, and as, even when found, it cannot always be drunk, they are obliged to have some always with them, to refresh themselves under this burning sky ! The shoe will appear strange to you ; it is a kind of clog or sandal, not unlike those used in France by some of the Franciscans : it is true these are attached to the

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 324.

foot with lathets, while the Indian sandals have no other hold than a wooden knob, between the great toe and the one next it.”¹

Thus equipped, boldly they went forth, doubtless exhibiting the frightful though ridiculous penances and postures of the Saniassi, whom they were compelled to copy with the utmost fidelity—for “our whole attention is given,” writes Father De Bourges, “to the concealing from the people that we are what they call Feringees,—the slightest suspicion of this on their part, would oppose an insurmountable obstacle to the propagation of the faith.”² “The missionaries are not known to be Europeans,” says Father Martin; “if they were believed to be so, they would be forced to abandon the country; for they could gain absolutely no fruit whatever. The conversion of the Hindoos is nearly impossible to evangelical labourers from Europe: I mean impossible to those who pass for Europeans, even though they wrought miracles.”³ So again, writing of the visit of the Jesuit-bishop Lainez to Aur, he says: “No other bishop until now had dared to penetrate into the interior, because, being ignorant of the language and customs of Madura, he would be sure to pass for a Feringee or European, in the opinion of the Hindoos, *which would have been the absolute ruin of Christianity.*”⁴ A famous heathen penitent was almost persuaded by some missionaries on the coast, where they appeared as Europeans, to embrace “the Christian religion;” but the idea of uniting himself to the despicable Feringees gave him great uneasiness. “Seeing this,” says Jesuit Martin, “we resolved to send him to Madura, to be

¹ Lett. Edif. xii. 101.

² Ib. xxi. 77.

³ Ib. xii. 132.

⁴ Ib. xii. 132.

baptised by one of the missionaries who live there as *Saniassis*. We told him, therefore, that we were but the gourous, or teachers, of the low castes on the coast, and that it was proper for him, as he was a person of quality, to apply to the teachers of the higher castes, who were inland." And the poor man *believed* them, and was baptised in Madura. "This simple fellow (*ce bon homme*) who had conceived a friendship for us, made great difficulty to undertake the proposal; but we persuaded him that it was for his advantage: *he believed us*, went, and was baptised by one of our fathers in Madura, who sent him back to convert his relatives, for whom he seemed to have great zeal and affection."¹

It will be remembered that this system—infamous it may be called—had for its chief object the conversion of the Brahmins, and that Xavier himself does not escape without a sneer at the low caste of his converts. Considered in this view, nothing could be more signal than the failure of the plot. The lordly Brahmins held disdainfully aloof, in open hostility or haughty suspicion. The wily fathers were over-matched. In falsehood, in cunning, in fraud, the Brahmins of Madura might perhaps be inferior to the sons of Loyola; but in austerities, mortification, and power over the people, they were more than their masters. Besides they fought at a disadvantage: for the Brahmins believed that they had truth on their side, while the Jesuits quailed under the consciousness of falsehood. A whole history may be gathered from a letter of Father Tachard, the superior of the mission, in 1703.

"Father de la Fontaine," he writes, "has had *extraordinary* good fortune since the commencement of his

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 99, *et seq.*

mission. In addition to more than a hundred adults from other distinguished castes, whom he has baptised, he counts amongst his neophytes *nine Brahmins*; that is to say, he alone has in eight months baptised more adult Brahmins than nearly all the missionaries of Madura have baptised in *ten years*. If these conversions continue, as we have reason to hope, he may be called *the Apostle of the Brahmins*; and should God give grace to a great number of these learned nobles, so that they embrace Christianity, all the other castes will be easily converted.”¹

Father de la Fontaine died fifteen years afterwards; but neither he nor any of his brethren has yet been called “the Apostle of the Brahmins.”

The Roman Saniassis were more successful in imposing on the simple country people of the lower castes. They gained over a considerable number of *Sudras*; but the bulk of their converts were *Pariahs*—just as in the times of Xavier, and subsequently. Father Mauduit unfolds, as follows, the economy of the glorious mission—curious, if not very edifying. “The catechist of a low caste,” says he, “can never be employed to teach Hindoos of a caste more elevated. The *Brahmins* and the *Sudras*, who form the principal and most numerous castes, have a far greater contempt for the *Pariahs*, who are beneath them, than princes in Europe can feel for the scum of the people. They would be dishonoured in their own country, and deprived of the privileges of their caste, if they ever listened to the instructions of one whom they look upon as infamous. We must therefore have Pariah catechists for the Pariahs, and Brahminical catechists for the Brahmins, which causes

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 331.

us a great deal of difficulty Some time ago a catechist from the Madura mission begged me to go to Pouleour, there to baptise some Pariah catechumens, and to confess certain neophytes of that caste. The fear that the Brahmins and Sudras might discover the step I had taken, and thence look upon me as infamous and unworthy ever after of holding any intercourse with them, *hindered me from going* (!) The words of the holy Apostle Paul, which I had read that morning at mass, determined me to take this resolution, —‘giving no offence to any one, that your ministry be not blamed.’—(2 Cor. vi. 3.) I therefore made these poor people go to a retired place, about three leagues thence, where I myself joined them *during the night, and with the most careful precautions*, and there I baptised nine.”¹

With all deference to Father Manduit, it may be doubted whether the apostolic injunction is very, if at all, consonant with this work of darkness; nor does the good-natured father tell the whole story. For, as is well known, the poor Pariahs had not only separate catechists but separate churches; and if they presumed to enter the church of a higher caste, they were driven out, and well whipped. Nay, even when they were dying, the Christian *Saniassis* refused to enter their dwellings; and the expiring wretch, in nature’s last agony, was dragged from his couch into the open air, or to a distant church, that the Saniassi, uncontaminated by entrance into the house, might, but without contact, administer the last rites of the Church.

Nothing was left undone to render the deception, the imposture, complete. The following story strangely

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 243—245.

illustrates the position of these pious impostors. Father Martin is the chronicler, and modest Father Bouchet is the worthy hero. Among the angels of Madura, there were three catechists, who, for certain reasons, were deprived of their offices. In revenge, they determined to ruin the missionaries and the mission. With this "detestable" purpose, they formed three heads of accusation against the fathers. The first was, that they were Feringees, or Europeans; that they had never paid tax or tribute to the prince of the country; and, lastly, that they had caused a monk of another Order to be murdered, on account of which the pope refused to canonise Father John de Britto. But the most formidable aspect of the affair was, that these exasperated catechists offered *twenty thousand crowns* to the prince, provided he would exterminate the Christians, and drive away Father Bouchet, against whom they were especially incensed. On the very same authority of Father Martin, we are informed that the *yearly* salary of a catechist was from eighteen to twenty crowns; and it is somewhat hard to guess whence came the 20,000; but veracious Father Martin is not the man to spoil a good story for a few thousands of crowns, more or less. Now, the prince regent in question was the most perfectly disinterested and greatest minister who ever bore rule in Madura. Nevertheless, Father Bouchet did not think it judicious to appear before this disinterested judge empty-handed; but, according to the custom of the country, he carried with him a present, and this present, though Father Bouchet speaks of it as a trifle (*peu de chose*), was by no means despicable. It consisted of a terrestrial globe, two feet in diameter, with the names written in *Tamul*;

a hollow glass sphere, about nine inches in diameter, silvered inside like a mirror ; some burning and multiplying lenses ; several Chinese curiosities, which had been sent to him from the Coromandel coast ; jet bracelets, set in silver ; a cock, formed of shell-work, and fabricated with great skill and beauty ; and a number of common mirrors and other like curiosities, which he got by gift or purchase.¹

After the same fashion, the father thought it prudent to win over several of the *grandees* of the court,—“ for it was of the utmost importance, for the honour of religion and the good of the church of Madura, that the doctors of the holy law should be received with some consideration, on the first occasion of their appearance at court ; in order to authorise thereby their ministry in the eyes of a people who, more than all others, blindly follow the will and inclinations of their sovereigns.” Having taken “ these wise and necessary precautions,” he demanded an audience, and was received with distinguished honour, as a Brahmin. “ This step was so bold,” says Father Martin, “ that no missionary had dared to perform it before then, fearing lest the colour of his face should betray him, and cause him to be recognised for an

¹ Father Bouchet does not explain the precise object of these *purchases*, which seem strangely out of place in the hut of a Saniassi and Jesuit who had vowed poverty. Norbert, speaking of a proposed interview between the Jesuit-bishop Lainez and the English governor of Madras, gives a fact which throws some light on the matter. The bishop, proposing to visit Madras, where the Jesuits were never very popular, wished to know how the governor would receive him : upon which, the governor wrote to him rather bluntly, that he should be received as a *capital merchant*, which he certainly was.—*Mémoires Historiques*, i. 353. M. Martin, the Governor of Pondicherry, asserts that the Jesuits carried on an immense commerce ; that from Father Tachard alone was due to the French Company, on account, more than 500,000 livres ; and that the Company's vessels often took home large bales for the Jesuits in France. “ Perhaps,” says Norbert, “ they contained relics.”—*Ubi suprâ*, p. 183.

European, which was to be avoided above all things, because this prince has so great a horror of Feringees, that, although engaged in a disastrous war, he expelled, not long since, some very skilful artillery-men, (who were in his service, and seemed indispensable to him) as soon as he found out that they were Europeans,”—whether they were lay-brother Jesuits is not stated, but it is probable enough, all things considered. However, we see the immense difficulty and jeopardy of this terrible interview. The Jesuit “took his wise and necessary precautions,” and “hoped in the goodness of God, who holds the hearts of princes in his hands,” &c., &c., and “he was not deceived.” The prince was delighted with the wonderful globe : the queen was rejoiced with the shell-work and the bracelets : the Jesuit was covered with a piece of gold brocade, sprinkled with rose-water, and seated on the same sofa with the prince, “so that their knees were in contact”—*et mit même ses genoux sur ceux du père*, which shews how completely every suspicion of his being an European was lulled to rest by this imitative Jesuit. He was himself surprised at the perfect success of the imposture. More than five hundred persons were present, the majority of whom were *Brahmins* ! He was then paraded through the streets of Trinchinopoly, in a magnificent state palanquin, to the sound of trumpets, like Mordecai of old, “from which the modesty of Father Bouchet had much to suffer,” says his brother Jesuit Martin. Finally he was assured, that anything he asked should be granted. “The success of this sort of triumph” he continues, “strengthened the neophytes in their faith, and *finally determined a great number of idolaters to ask for holy baptism*,” after the great Brahmin, “who had come from the north and

the quarters of the great city Rome," was thus carried in triumph to his residence, which was distant about twelve miles from the capital. A word from Father Bouchet would have banished the offending catechists from the kingdom ; but he was content with the sentence of excommunication which had been already fulminated against them by one of the missionaries. Rejected alike by the Christian and the heathen, after six months' perseverance, two of them came and threw themselves at the father's feet. "The father," says Jesuit Martin, "who had long sighed for the return of these erring sheep, received them with kindness ; and after public confession, and an authentic retractation, made in the church, of their infamous desertion, and their foul and calumnious accusations—*leurs calomnieuses et noires accusations* (!), they received absolution, and were again admitted into the number of the faithful." The third remained obstinate in his apostacy. But how did Father Bouchet satisfy the prince that he was not an *European* ? How could he, in the church, in the face of God, force the catechists to retract, as false, what he knew to be true, and prostitute for his own ends—or the senseless scheme in hand—the most solemn ordinances of religion ? It is stated that a fit of illness was the result of all his anxieties.¹

With the sword thus ever suspended over their heads, it may be imagined in what continual misery and dread of detection these wretched Jesuits must have lived. This fear is sometimes carried to the verge of the ludicrous. Thus Father Saignez, who, from exposure to the sun, "had changed his skin three times like a serpent," trembles lest the new skin should be *whiter*

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 163, 182.

than the old, and so lead the people to suspect that he was a *Feringee*.¹ At other times their terror, in that “hypocrisy invisible, except to God alone” and themselves, was almost sublime :—an anonymous missionary, who had been thrown into prison, preferred to *die* in his bonds rather than be indebted for his liberty to Europeans on the coast, whose interference in his behalf might give rise to a suspicion that he was connected with them.² It reminds us of Garnet, anxious to the last moment for the fame of his Company—equivocating to the very judgment-seat of God. The sublimity of the thing is like that of Milton’s Satan—impelled with one absorbing “idea”—and lurking in Eden amidst the beasts in congregation,

“ — himself now one,
Now other, as their shape served best his end.”

It may be taken for granted, that when Christian missionaries assumed the orange cloth and the tiger’s skin to sit on, in their audiences with the native princes, and professed by the most evident implication, if not by positive assertion (probable enough), to have sprung from the head of the divine Brahma ; it may be taken for granted with such premises, that they must have allowed in their followers a like conformity to the superstitions of the country, even although Father Tremblay has asserted in the most confident terms, that a native Christian could scarcely endure so much as to look upon an idol—an edifying result for the curious, but unthinking, all-swallowing devotees of Europe. Now let us assist at a grand Christian solemnity contrived by the Jesuit-mind.

¹ Lett. Edif. xiv. 41.

² Ibid. xiii. 24.

In the year of our Lord 1700, the Jesuits of Pondicherry celebrated the festival of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. No expense was spared on the glorious occasion. The drums, hautboys, trumpets, and other instruments were borrowed from the neighbouring pagodas; the musicians were the same as played before Brahma, Shiva, Vishnu, and the remarkable Hindoo goddess *Mariti*, among the myriad of divinities of this sacred humanity. The day's grand doings terminated with a nocturnal procession. An immense car approaches, covered with silk awnings, and gaudily decked with fruit and flowers. It is dragged slowly on its creaking wheels by a tumultuous crowd, and surmounted by a female figure. She has over her head the *Tirubashi*, or five resplendent arches, in commemoration of the deed which Shiva performed when the moon was extricated from her unfortunate darkness and malediction. On each side of the image are men with parasols in their hands, and one holds a napkin, with which he carefully drives away the musquitoes. The car is preceded by dancers, half naked, and streaked with sandal-wood and vermilion. Wild shouts ring through the sky, and the air is stunned with a confused din of horns, trumpets, tom-toms, or drums, kettle-drums, and other instruments of music. It is night; but, amid the grand illumination and the blaze of innumerable torches, rockets, wheels, Roman candles, and other "flaming dragons," shoot up in every direction. The crowd is of the usual motley description—all Hindoos, presided over by Father Dolu—and with all the characteristic marks of India's exuberant idolatry. The car is the gift of a heathen prince—the dancers, and many of the musicians, are borrowed from the nearest pagoda—

the spectators idolaters ; but the woman represents the Virgin Mary of *Rome*, and the actors in this scandalous scene are the Christian angels of Madura.¹

If in excuse of these disgusting mockeries of Christianity, we are reminded of examples in the Bible, connected with the names of Miriam and David before the Ark, and all the house of Israel, on certain festive occasions, without condescending to point out the impossible similitude, we may boldly, heartily, and righteously ask—are we to copy every sample *recorded* in the Bible ? It is, in truth, a bitter experience, that man's worst selfishness and vilest passions shrink not from appealing to deeds, which a false interpretation confounds with the principles of Christian uprightness, sufficiently salient in the book, without requiring any other medium than each individual nature, through mind and heart enlightened, to promote right action.

¹ Norbert, i. 64, *et seq.* ; Mackay, p. 25. The Abbé Dubois, himself a more modern missionary, thus writes on the subject in 1823, showing how the "custom" had descended and was still in vigour : "The Hindoo pageantry is chiefly seen in the festivals celebrated by the native Christians. Their processions in the streets, always performed in the night time, have indeed been to me, at all times, a subject of shame. Accompanied with hundreds of *tom-toms* (small drums), trumpets, and all the discordant noisy music of the country,—with numberless torches, and fire-works,—the statue of the saint placed on a car which is laden with garlands of flowers, and other gaudy ornaments, according to the taste of the country,—the car slowly dragged by a multitude shouting all along the march,—the congregation surrounding the car all in confusion, several among them dancing, or playing with small sticks, or with naked swords : some wrestling, some playing the fool, all shouting, or conversing with each other, without any one exhibiting the least sign of respect or devotion—such is the mode in which the Hindoo Christians of the *inland* country celebrate their festivals." In fact, Dubois expressly says that "the first missionaries," *i. e.* the Jesuits, "incumbered the Catholic worship with an additional superstruction of outward show, unknown in Europe, which, in many instances, does not differ much from that prevailing among the Gentiles, and which is far from proving a subject of edification to many a good and sincere Roman Catholic."—*Dubois, Letters*, pp. 69, 70.

How lovingly the Christians and the heathens associated together on such occasions, Father Martin tells us, alluding to another festival—not that of “Mary,” but of “Jesus!” “The chief man of the place with all his family, and the other *heathens* who were present in the procession, prostrated themselves three times before the image of the risen Jesus, and *adored* it in a manner which happily blended them with the most fervent of the Christians!” The usual procession, with triumphal car, was not dispensed with—“they placed in it the image of the *Saviour risen again*, and the car was led three times round the church, to the sound of many instruments. The illuminations, flying fusees, rockets, wheels and other fire-works, in which the Hindoos excel, rendered the festival magnificent.”¹

A great number of baptisms followed this striking exhibition, to show to the pagans, that there was really very little difference between the two religious systems in question; “at this festival they opened their eyes to the truth, and they could no longer resist the interior voice which pressed them to yield”—at the sight of a miserable figure representing the resurrection, amid all the merriment usual in the degrading ceremonies of a pagan festival.

It will not surprise us to find that the Jesuits applied

¹ Lett. Edif. xi. 148. “La nuit du samedi au dimanche, je fis preparer un petit char de triomphe, que nous ornâmes de pièces de soi, de fleurs et de fruits. On y plaça l’image du Sauveur ressuscité, et le char fut conduit en triomphe par trois fois autour de l’église, au son de plusieurs instruments. Les illuminations, les fusées volantes, les lances à feu, les girandoles et diverses autres feux d’artifice où les Indiens excellent, rendaient la fête magnifique Le seigneur de la peuplade avec toute sa famille, et le reste des Gentiles qui assistèrent à la procession, se prosternèrent par trois fois devant l’image de Jésus ressuscité, et l’adorèrent d’une manière qui les confondaient heureusement avec les Chrétiens les plus fervens.”

their inventive faculties to the construction of curious and edifying contrivances, in India, as elsewhere. The traveller, Mandelslo, at Goa, in 1639, describes an entertainment given by the fathers, at which the archbishop of the colony was present :—

“At the upper end of the pillar came out a flower, made like a tulip, which opened of itself, while they danced, till at last there came out of it *an image of the blessed Virgin with her child in her arms*, and the pillar itself opened in three several places to cast out perfumed waters like a fountain. The Jesuits told us, that by that invention they represented the pains they had taken in planting, among the pagans and Mahometans of those parts, the Church of God, whereof our Saviour is the only pillar, or corner stone. There came in also one man alone, who was covered with birds’ nests, and clothed and masked according to the Spanish mode, who began the *farce* of this comedy by ridiculous and fantastic postures ; and the dance was concluded with the coming in of twelve boys, dressed like *apes*, which they imitated in their cries and postures. As we took leave of our entertainers, they told us that they made use of these divertisements, *as well* to reduce the pagans and Mahometans of those parts to the embracing of the Christian religion by that kind of modern devotion, as to amuse the children, and divert them after their studies.”¹ This contrivance throws some light on the miraculous water issuing from “St. Thomas’s Cross,” before described, with its changing colours, cloud, and profuse perspiration, as minutely described by the Jesuit Tachard.

The dancers attracted also the special admiration of

¹ Mandelslo, Travels into the Indies, Book ii. ; Mackay, p. 26.

the devout Catholic nobleman Pietro Della Valle, visiting Goa in 1624 ; and fine showy fellows they were. Naked from the waist upwards, with painted bodies and gold bracelets and necklaces ; with flowers in their turbans, gay parti-coloured hose, and gallant streamers hanging below the knee, “so that,” says Della Valle, “in the festivities made at Goa for the canonisation of Sts. Ignatius and Xavier, though in other things they were most solemn and sumptuous, yet in my conceit there was nothing more worthy to be seen for delight than the many pretty and jovial dances which intervened in the tragedy.”¹

Usages of the country, doubtless ; manners of the age : be it so ; but what were the consequences ? Turn to an open and veritable procession of idolaters. Who are those in the throng, with cymbal and trumpets, with kettle-drum and horn, as loud as any in the idol-worship ? They are the Christians of Madura. What ! those angels who rarely commit a venial sin, and, from their horror of idolatry, scruple to pass by a heathen temple ? Even so :—there they are round the idol, as loud and as busy as the most zealous of its worshippers. And Father Bouchet and Father Bartolde deplore the scandal, but cannot promise the apostolic legate that it shall cease. What can they do, indeed ? *It is the custom.* Vain are threats : vain are fulminations. The legate dies in a foreign prison, and Father Bouchet and Bartolde go to their last account ; but sixty years afterwards this “Christian” practice is in full vigour. Fra Bartolomeo tells of “a diabolical nocturnal orgy,” during which the statue of Shiva is carried round, with the *Lingam* before him. At this festival the Christians

¹ Travels into the East Indies, p. 165 ; Mackay, *ut antea*.

of the country are required to be present; and there is a dance, to which the Christian women are invited—those that do not go voluntarily being compelled to attend. Fra Bartolomeo applied to the heathen magistrate to prevent the overseers of the temple from compelling the Christians to be partakers in this detestable festival. “The overseers, however,” says he, “found means to make a thousand excuses, and always referred to *ancient* usage.”¹

Nor was this all. The distinction of castes was rigorously observed. The Pariahs had separate churches, fonts, confessionals, and communion-tables. Marriages were celebrated between children seven years old, and with nearly the whole idolatrous ceremonial of the heathens. The wives of the Christians had suspended from their necks the indecent *Taly*, representing the god *Pollear*, the disgusting *Priapus* of the Greeks. The Brahmin retained his *poita*; the sandal-wood and the ashes of cow’s dung were applied, and charmed the body as before, by the virtue of the goddess Lakshmi—cleansing from sin. These ashes were blessed by the missionaries, and used by the Christians of Madura. When they rubbed the powder on the head and forehead, they used the formula—“May the god Shiva be within my head!” When they rubbed it on the chest, they said—“May the god Rudren be in my breast!” When applied to the neck, they said—“May Ishuren be in my neck!” When to the shoulders, they said—“May Bhairab be in my shoulders!” In like manner there is a distinct god, and a distinct invocation, for the arms, the ears, the eyes, the groin, the back, the stomach, the legs, the knees, and feet; and they conclude all these

¹ Voyage to the East Indies, p. 119; Mackay, p. 27.

fine invocations by putting a little of the ashes into their mouths, saying—"By this last action I declare that all is finished as it ought to be."¹

And the results of this extraordinary mission-scheme—what were they numerically? The real number of the Jesuit-converts is involved in impenetrable mystery. In the sixteenth century, the converts of Xavier are said to have amounted to half a million. In the beginning of the eighteenth century, the native Christians in Madura are reckoned by Father Martin to amount to 150,000. He also tells us that each missionary baptised at least 1000 annually, and that some of them much exceeded that number; for instance, Father Bouchet baptised more than 30,000 souls in twelve years.² Father Lainez, in Maravas, "tinged with the sacred waters" no less than 10,000 pagans in twenty-two months.³ In 1700 there were but seven or eight Jesuits in the mission; but in 1750 they had in southern India upwards of twenty. Taking ten only as a fair mean, we cannot put down the yearly increase by conversion at less than 20,000; and these, it is to be presumed, were *adults*, for Father Martin assures us that the missionaries "only baptise after hard probation, and three or four months' instruction." Now, allowing that the births and deaths merely counterbalanced each other, there should have been, in 1770, about the time the Jesuits left the mission, at least a million and a half of native Christians in Maravas and Madura. To this must be added the increase in Xavier's half a million of converts on the Pearl coast, during a period of three hundred years. Yet, in 1776, Fra Paolino da San

¹ Norbert, ii. 225, 238; vi. 47, *et seq.*; Mackay, pp. 26, 35.

² Lett. Edif. x. 23.

³ Ibid. x. 285.

Bartolomeo found but 18,000 in Madura, 10,000 in Tanjore, and in Carnada 20,000.¹

The Rev. W. S. Mackay shall sum up this curious and edifying mission :—

“Reader ! is it not a glorious picture ? Behold the heavenly Christians of Madura. Behold their sinless and angelic lives, their pure and spiritual worship of God, their zealous dread of the very appearance of idolatry. Behold how the devils tremble before the weakest of that revered band, and the tigers slink cowering aside, and grin with impotent malice. Behold how miracles are as daily food, and all is so fair, so pure, so holy, that we doubt whether heaven or earth is set before us in the modest pages of the apostolic labourers in this rich vineyard. Who would not wish to be there ?

¹ Mackay, p. 24 ; Bartolomeo, p. 65. Forster, the German translator of Bartolomeo, says in a note : “ This estimation of the number of the Roman Catholic Christians (48,000), is certainly too high, even if we should forget how the missionaries of the Romish Church behave in regard to their so-called converts. They insinuate themselves as physicians into the houses of the Indians ; draw a wet cloth over the head and forehead of a sick person, even when at the point of death ; mutter privately to themselves, the baptism service ; and think they have made one Christian more, who is immediately added to the list.” In effect, Father de Bourges says, “ When the children are in danger of death, our practice is to baptise them without asking the permission of their parents, which would certainly be refused. The catechists and the private Christians are well acquainted with the formula of baptism, and they confer it on these dying children, *under the pretext of giving them medicine.*”—*Lett. Edif.* xii. 107. Father Bouchet mentions one woman “ whose knowledge of the pulse, and of the symptoms of approaching death, was so unerring, that of more than *ten thousand* children, whom she had herself baptised, not more than *two* escaped death.”—*Lett. Edif.* xiii. 54. Again, during a famine in the Carnatic, in 1737, Father Tremblay states the number of such baptisms to be upwards of 12,000. He adds, that it was rare, in any place where there were neophytes, *for a single heathen child to die unbaptised.*—*Lett. Edif.* xiv. 185, 186. The same practice is copied in China at the *present day*,—as I have before stated, from a letter of Bishop Besy, of Nankin, namely, “ a certain number of pious widows, somewhat acquainted with medicine, who, under pretext of administering remedies to the dying infants of the pagans, will be able to confer on them baptism.”—*Annals of the Propagation*, v. 328, Anno 1844.

Who would not exclaim, with Father Lopez—‘ Ah ! how happy you are, my dear Father Martin ! Would that I might accompany you ! But, alas ! I am unworthy ever to associate with that band of saints who labour there.’ Insensibly the mind wanders back to the golden age, to the fabled El Dorado of enthusiasts, to the gorgeous visions of Cloud-land, to the poet’s dream of beauty, too bright, too delicate, too ethereal, ever to be realised on this lower earth, amidst the strife of human passions. And, as when on the shores of Sicily, temple, and palace, and tower, rise in their exceeding loveliness from the bosom of the waters, and we know that they are unreal, and fear to move even an eyelid, lest the glorious show should vanish, and nought remain but common rock and sea : so, amidst these glowing descriptions, something seems to warn us not to approach too close, lest this Jesuitical paradise should vanish into the air, and leave behind, not apostles and angels, but a paganised Christianity, and wicked and crafty men. And even so it is ! The high-born Robert de’ Nobili, and the martyred Britto, over whose head hangs canonisation suspended by but a single hair, Father Tachard, and wily Bishop Lainez, Fathers Bouchet, Martin, Turpin, De Bourges, Mauduit, Calmette, the learned Beschi, the noble De la Fontaine, and the veteran Père Le Gac—in a word, every Jesuit who entered within these unholy bounds, bade adieu to principle and truth—all became perjured impostors ; and the lives of all ever afterwards were but one long, persevering, toilsome LIE. Upon the success of a lie their mission depended. Its discovery (we have it under their own hands) was fraught with certain and irremediable ruin. Yet they persevered. Suspected by the heathen, they persevered. Through

toils, austerities, and mortifications almost intolerable to human nature, disowned and refused communion by their brother-missionaries, condemned by their own general, stricken by pope after pope with the thunders of the Vatican, knowing that the apostolic damnation had gone forth against all who ‘do evil that good may come,’—yet they persevered. For one hundred and fifty years was enacted this prodigious falsehood, continually spreading and swelling into more portentous dimensions, and engulfing within its fatal vortex, zeal, talents, self-denial, and devotion, unsurpassed in modern times. Men calling themselves the servants of the true God, went forth clad in the armour of hell; and, sowing perjury and falsehood, they expected to reap holiness and truth. Thus were the Jesuits guilty of that very crime which Dr. Wiseman most falsely ascribes to the Lutherans:—thus was engendered the most horrible of ‘religious chimæras—the worship of Christ united to the service of devils.’¹ ”

¹ Wiseman, Lectures, i. 260. I may as well quote the whole passage which this worthy doctor and Bishop of Melipotamus, and now of the “London District,” delivered from a *pulpit* to his admiring party. “Lutheranism was for years forced upon the docile natives of Ceylon, and engendered the most horrible of religious chimæras,—the worship of Christ united to the service of devils! The Independents have laboured, long and zealously, for the conversion of the teachable and uncorrupted natives of the Sandwich and Society Islands, and they have perfectly succeeded in *ruining their industrious habits*, exposing the country to *external aggression*, and internal dissension, and disgusting all who originally supported them. But, on the other hand, the Catholic religion seems to have a grace and an efficacy peculiar to itself, which allows it to take hold on *every variety of disposition and situation*.” Unquestionably! And it is this very versatility which has ever made it a specious speculation, fooling mankind with Dead-Sea apples—fair enough without, but bitter ashes to digestion. And is there a single country on which Rome’s missionary scheme has been brought to bear, without producing “feuds, quarrels, and disputes” (the doctor’s own words, vol. i. p. 197)—misery of every possible kind—instancing only *England*, as we have seen, to attest the undeniable conviction? Dr. Wiseman flippantly and boastfully scorns the Protestant missionaries “going with their wives in litters round countries”—

Results and consequences were commensurate with the abuses. Eight popes, in eighty years, had passed into eternity; and the Malabar rites, strengthened by the practice of a century, were more deeply rooted than ever. And now the Jesuits, blinded by success, lost sight of their usual prudence. Through the weakness of the governor of Pondicherry, who, at their repeated solicitations, gave them illegal possession of a famous Hindoo pagoda, that city was all but lost to the French, and the tumult was with difficulty appeased by allowing the Brahmins to take triumphant possession of their temple. Hebert, the next governor, at first opposed them, for their constant intermeddling in the affairs of the French Commercial Company, and for forcing their converts into families, nominally as servants, but really as “domestic spies.” His description, indeed, of these marvellous neophytes is strangely different from that of the Curious and Edifying Letters. He speaks of them as men “of scandalous life,—lazy, superstitious, and almost universally given to thieving;” and reproaches the missionaries for allowing them to retain nearly all their superstitions and idolatrous ceremonies, such as the cocoa-nut at marriages, the mirror at funerals, for the dead man to see his soul, the marks on their foreheads, and the heathen music in their processions, as well as for their cruel treatment of the *Pariahs*.¹ Norbert gives his letter in full. It brought Hebert into trouble at the French court, where Père La Chaise, the royal Jesuit confessor, was powerful. Hebert was

strange words for a pulpit, opposite the “Blessed Sacrament :” but surely a wife is a more appropriate companion to a missionary than a lap-dog is to a bishop—such as the worthy doctor used to exhibit in his carriage, in his “visitations.”

¹ Platel, Mem. Hist. i. 40, ed. Besançon ; Mackay, p. 29.

recalled in disgrace, to be sent out, shortly afterwards, the reluctant but obedient tool of the Jesuits.

About the same time, in the year 1701, arose a persecution of the Christians in Tanjore, caused by a public outrage on the idols of the country, during one of the processions in Pondicherry. The images of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva were broken to pieces by a native Christian, who represented St. George in a religious tragedy got up by the Jesuits. Father Tachard assures us that *twelve thousand* Christians stood firm in the hour of trial, and endured the most cruel sufferings for the faith.¹ On the contrary, Norbert assures the pope that, to the shame of their Christian profession, not *one* was ready to seal his faith with his blood; and that, while a few families fled to the coast for shelter, the Christians of Tanjore flocked by thousands to the pagodas, to renounce Christ, and receive the indelible mark of Vishnu, branded on their shoulders. Two Jesuits were captured: one died in prison, the other was liberated on condition of his leaving the kingdom:—the mission of Tanjore was utterly ruined, the Christian worship being utterly prohibited.²

And then the famous struggle began respecting the Malabar rites. In their conduct towards the monkish missionaries, the Jesuits in India had exhibited the same exclusiveness which embittered the English mission.³ It may, therefore, be supposed that no good feeling existed between the religious rivals; but it would be scarcely fair to attribute the representations against

¹ Lett. Edif. x. 317; Mackay, p. 29.

² Platel, i. 74, *et seq.*

³ See Platel, i. 72, for an instance with regard to the Capuchins, whom they strove to dislodge from Tanjore.

the objectionable rites merely to "motives of envy and jealousy against the Jesuits, rather than a true disinterested zeal for the cause of religion." At all events, these representations took effect, notwithstanding the strong appeals on the part of the Jesuits, in defence of their practices. Their reasons appeared futile and merely evasive in the opinion of the Holy See; and the Jesuits were peremptorily ordered to preach the Catholic religion in all its purity, and altogether to suppress the superstitious practices, till then tolerated among the neophytes. The Jesuits, seeing that their compliance with such directions would not only put a stop to all further conversions, but also occasion the apostacy of a great many proselytes, before they gave up the point, sent deputations to Rome, in order to enlighten the Holy See on the subject. This disgusting contest was carried on in several instances with much acrimony, and lasted more than forty years before it was concluded. At length, the reigning pope, Clement XI., anxious to finish the business, sent Cardinal De Tournon to India, with the title of apostolic legate, to make personal inquiries on the subject, and report all the details to the Holy See. On his arrival, Tournon denounced the practices by a public censure; but was induced by the Jesuits, with Tachard at their head, to suspend the execution of the decree for a time, until gradual reformation could be effected. Meanwhile, they sent round among the missionaries, for signature, a document which declared all the superstitious practices absolutely indispensable to the existence of the mission. The Jesuit Bouchet actually made oath to his general, that he believed no alteration could be permitted without "evident danger to the salvation and the souls of the

neophytes.” Other Jesuits took the same oath, which was attested by their signatures. Bouchet and Lainez proceeded to Rome with the document ; the Jesuits in India made every effort to put down the agitation against their system ; and Tournon, who had gone to China on the same investigation, was thrown into prison, it is said, at the instance of the Jesuits. There he died, not without accusing the fathers of his many bitter sufferings. In vain Clement XI. issued breve after breve ; in vain the Jesuits were branded as “alike obstinate and impudent :”—they firmly held to their beloved rites, and practised them as devoutly as ever.¹

At length the famous and very learned Benedict XIV., having been raised to the papal chair, and wishing to put a stop to this scandalous contest, issued a very rigorous bull in several articles, by which he formally and expressly condemned and reprobated all the superstitious practices (a list of which was contained in the instrument), till then tolerated by the missionaries, and required that the whole of them, of whatever order or dignity they might be, should bind themselves by a solemn oath, taken before a bishop, to conform themselves, without any tergiversation whatever, to the spirit and letter of the decree :—it was moreover ordered, that the decree should be read and published every Sunday in all churches and chapels, in the presence of the congregation, and a promise of submission to it be required from all the converts.²

These orders were reluctantly complied with ; and the result at once confirmed the clamorous charges against the Jesuits, with respect to the objectionable rites they permitted. A great number of the proselytes

¹ Dubois, pp. 8, *et seq.* ; Platel, iii. ; Mackay, pp. 30, 41.

² Dubois, p. 10.

preferred to renounce their new religion rather than abandon their practices. A stop was put to conversions. The Christian religion became odious to the Hindoos now that it was no longer ingrafted on the time-honoured rites of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva. The card-castle thus crumbling of itself, was utterly given to the winds by the hungry wars which supervened at the very time, between the French Christians and the English Christians struggling for supremacy in India. The Europeans till then almost entirely unknown to the natives of the interior—the angelic Madura—now introduced themselves in several ways, and under various denominations, into every part of the country. Then came to pass a crushing retribution. The Hindoos soon found that those missionaries, whom their colour, their talents, and other qualities, had induced them to regard as such extraordinary beings—as men coming from another world—were in fact, nothing but disguised, abominable *Feringees*; and that their country, their religion, and original education, were the same as those of the other vile, contemptible *Feringees* who were now invading their country. This was the finishing stroke to the gigantic falsehood of the Jesuit-mission. No more “conversions” were made. Apostacy became almost general in several quarters. “Christianity” became more and more an object of contempt and aversion, in proportion as the European manners became better known to the Hindoos, who, to all intents and purposes, were better men, as pagans, than their religious teachers, with their despicable system of falsehood.¹

“In order to give you,” says the Abbé Dubois, “a striking idea of the religious dispositions of the Hindoo,

¹ Dubois, pp. 10, 12.

and as a strong instance of what I asserted above, that there was to be found among them, nothing else but *a vain phantom* of Christianity, without any real or practical faith, I will, with shame and confusion, quote the following scandalous instance. When the late Tippoo Sultan sought to extend his own religious creed all over his dominions, and make by little and little all the inhabitants in Mysore, converts to Islamism, he wished to begin this fanatical undertaking with the native Christians living in his country, as the most odious to him, on the score of their religion. In consequence, in the year 1784, he gave secret orders to his officers in the different districts, to make the most diligent inquiries after the places where the Christians were to be found, and to cause the whole of them to be seized on the same day, and conducted under strong escorts to Seringapatam. This order was punctually carried into execution : very few of them escaped ; and we have it from good authority, that the aggregated number of the persons seized in this manner, amounted to more than 60,000. Some time after their arrival at Seringapatam, Tippoo ordered the whole to undergo the rites of circumcision, and be made converts to Mahometanism. The Christians were put together during the several days that the ceremony lasted : and, oh shame ! oh scandal ! will it be believed in the Christian world ? no one, not a single individual among so many thousands, had courage enough to confess his faith under this trying circumstance, and become a martyr to his religion. The whole apostatised *en masse*, and without resistance, or protestations, tamely underwent the operation—no one among them possessing resolution enough so say, ‘I am a Christian, and will rather die than renounce my

religion ! So general a defection, so dastardly an apostacy, is, I believe, unexampled in the annals of Christianity. After the fall of Tippoo Sultan, most of these apostates came back to be reconciled to their former religion, saying that their apostacy had been only external, and they always kept, in their hearts, the true faith in Christ. About 2,000 of them fell in my way, and nearly 20,000 returned to the Mangalore district, whence they had been carried away, and rebuilt their former places of worship. God preserve them all from being exposed in future to the same trials ; for should this happen, I have every reason (notwithstanding their solemn protestations when again reconciled to Christianity), to apprehend the same sad results, that is to say, a tame submission, and a general apostacy.”¹

Elsewhere, after a sketch of the several missions in India, Dubois declares :—“ You will perceive that the number of neophytes, although reduced to no more than a third of what it was about seventy years ago, is yet considerable ; and it would afford some consolation, if at least a due proportion amongst them were real and unfeigned Christians. But, alas ! this is far from being the case. The greater, the far greater number exhibit nothing but a vain phantom, an empty shade of Christianity. In fact, during a period of twenty-five years that I have familiarly conversed with them, lived among them as their religious teacher and spiritual guide, I would hardly dare to affirm that I have anywhere met a sincere and undisguised Christian. In embracing the Christian religion, they very seldom heartily renounce their leading superstitions, towards which they always entertain a secret bent, which does not fail to manifest

¹ Dubois, Letters, pp. 73, 75.

itself in the several occurrences of life, and in many circumstances where the precepts of the Christian religion are found to be in opposition to their leading usages, they rarely scruple to overlook the former, and conform themselves to the latter.”¹

Such then was the fate of the gorgeous mission founded by Robert de 'Nobili, and forming a large section of the mendacious absurdities which generally make up the *Edifying and Curious Letters* of the Jesuits. It will be remembered that this fate nearly chanced before, at the denunciation of the three catechists. It was then forfended by Bouchet's unblushing effrontery and heaven-defying falsehood: but it came at last—as every other retribution on the Jesuits.²

Tournon's apostolic visit to China, for the investigation of the *Chinese Customs*, was followed by the same result, their proscription being included in the papal bull which prohibited the rites of Malabar. These objectionable customs related at first to the worship accorded to their ancestors by the Chinamen,—particularly the veneration of Confucius. The Dominicans appealed to Rome

¹ Dubois, *Letters*, pp. 62, 63.

² For a full and well-compiled account of the Jesuits in India, see Mr. Mackay's pamphlet before named, which I have found very useful and strictly correct, with the single exception stated in a former note. It is published under the title of “A Warning from the East; or, The Jesuits as Missionaries in India,” by Cotes: London. The famous Norbert or Platel is very voluminous, but still interesting on the subject; his seven *quarto* volumes are rich in facts, set forth with energy, and always probable from the admitted principles of the Jesuits, and their undeniable conduct in other careers. Platel was fiercely persecuted by the Jesuits, and driven from country to country, until he took refuge in Portugal. The Jesuit Feller has given him a bitter notice in his *Universal Biography*, stating, among other disparagements, that he was condemned by the *Bishop of Sisteron*: but he takes good care not to state that this Bishop of Sisteron was a *Jesuit*—and a most despicable creature of the infamous Cardinal Dubois, to whose schemes he lent himself with base devotedness, as shall be presently exhibited.

against these ceremonies ; the Jesuits defended them as indispensable to the existence of the mission. Still, in the midst of the incessant bickerings of the preachers, the religion inculcated by the missionaries was allowed to flourish : the authorities finding the Jesuits very learned, skilful, and generally useful servants. But it seems that the Chinese were permitted to observe all their other peculiar customs, or the most important ; and that the nominal Christians were merely disciples of the learned Jesuits, who were pleased to consider the pagan customs mere civil observances. Certainly from the “doubts” proposed by Navarette, at Rome, in 1674, as to the objectionable practices of the Chinese Christians, the conclusion is obvious that it was as easy for a pagan to be a Christian in China, as it was in Malabar.¹ The multitudinous details which were thrown before the world, during the party-discussion of the question, present no feature of interest :—the charges on the part of the rival missionaries were met by the Jesuits with their usual hardihood ; when, at length, Benedict XIV., in 1744, “resolved all doubts,” says Cretineau, “cut short all difficulties, and sacrificed the uncertain to the certain, the hopes of the future to the realities of the present,”—by an universal proscription of every rite and practice, which had hitherto formed the necessary conditions on which the Chinamen had given in their adhesion to the rivals of the bonzas, the astronomers, the astrologers, mechanicians, philosophers, and statesmen of the Celestial Empire. This was the second fulmination of the Vatican, the first, in 1715, not having taken due effect,—for whilst the papal interference with the religious concerns of the Chinamen, had caused the

¹ See *Morale Pratique*, t. vi.

expulsion of the rival missionaries, the Jesuits had been wisely retained by the emperor as men whom he could not dispense with, due regard being had to their versatile talents and useful qualifications. Twenty learned Jesuits, with the admirable Parrenin, basked in the uncertain rays of royal favour, whilst their less gifted, less qualified, if not less accommodating rivals in the mission, were banished the country. This "singular position," as Cretineau calls it, is thus described by Father Gaubil in a letter from Pekin, in 1726 :—"The Jesuits have here three large churches : they baptise annually 3000 exposed infants. To judge from the confessions and communions there are about 3000 male communicants, and about 4000 female Christians. In this number there are only four or five small mandarins, two or three literati : the rest are poor people. I do not know the number of the literati and mandarins who, being Christians, do not frequent the sacraments ; and I do not exactly see how, in the circumstances, a mandarin or any of the literati can do so and comply with the decrees of our holy father the pope. The Christian princes, whose fervour and misfortunes you witnessed, with two other princes, have renounced their dignities and appointments to live as Christians.¹ Thus we

¹ Voltaire makes some sensible remarks on this proscription. The emperor told the Jesuits : "If you have been able to deceive my father, don't expect to deceive me in like manner." "In spite of the wise commands of the emperor," says Voltaire, "some Jesuits returned secretly into the provinces :—they were condemned to death for having manifestly violated the laws of the empire. Thus we execute the Huguenot preachers in France, who come to make their gatherings, in spite of the king's orders. This fury of proselytism is the peculiar distemper of our climates :—it has been always unknown in Upper Asia. Those nations have never sent missionaries into Europe. Our nations alone have desired to drive their opinions, like their commerce, to the two extremities of the globe. The Jesuits even brought down death upon several Chinamen, especially on two princes of the blood, who

baptise only poor people. The literati and official personages who might wish to become Christians, quit us as soon as ever we publish the decrees to them—even with the permissions conceded by the Patriarch Mezza-barba. The emperor does not like our religion. The great and the princes avoid us accordingly. We seldom appear at the court. The emperor needs our services for the tribunal of the mathematics—for the affairs of the Moscovites—and for the instruments and other things which come from Europe. He fears that should he drive us hence and from Canton, the merchants will not continue to visit that city:—these are the reasons why he permits us to remain here and at Canton, and, from time to time, even accords us certain favours and extraordinary honours. In one word, he suspects us:—a thousand secret enemies speak to him against us. The past disputes, the visitations of the two patriarchs, the generally diffused idea that we are not loyal, and that we have no fixity in our laws—all this renders the missionaries contemptible. If we continue in this condition three or four years consecutively, my reverend father, it will be all over with the cause—our religion will be ruined here—lost without resource. . . . I do not think that there are in China and Tartary, more than 300,000 Christians.¹ In Tartary, there are not

favoured them. Was it not very wretched to come from the further end of the world in order to fling confusion into the imperial family, and cause the death of two princes by public execution? They thought they could render their mission respectable in the eyes of Europe by pretending that God sided with them, and that He had caused to appear four crosses in the skies, over the horizon of China. They engraved the figures of these crosses in the *Edifying and Curious Letters*: but if God had wished that China should be Christian, would He have only put crosses in the air? Would He not have placed them in the heart of the Chinamen?—*Siccle de Louis XIV.*, p. 503.

¹ Butler says only 100,000.—*Martyrs of China*, Feb. 5.

more than five or six thousand. It is useless to fill your heart with bitterness in assuring you that, had it not been for the past disputes, there would have been four or five millions of Christians in China.”¹

These were splendid prospects to be realised by the baptism of exposed infants—the frightful practice of the Chinese as rife as ever. Two thousand five hundred in two years thus “went to heaven”—*sont allés au ciel*; and but for the persecution, the work would have been regularly set on foot in several large towns, and in a few years, “we would have sent to heaven more than 20,000 little children *per annum*,—*on aurait envoyé par an dans le ciel plus de vingt mille petits enfans*.”²

Parrenin had continued the functions of grand mandarin and mediator between the Russians and the Chinese as usual. Bouvet, the imperial geographer, plied his compasses as before. Gaubil was the imperial interpreter of Europe at the Court of China, and had succeeded to Parrenin as director of the college for the young Manchous, after the death of the grand mandarin. His multitudinous labours in the service of the emperor were not interrupted. The Chinaman consented to receive the Jesuits as artists and mathematicians, whilst he rejected or proscribed them as missionaries.³ And nothing could be more reasonable than the reply made by the emperor’s brother to Parrenin, respecting the proscription of the religion in question. The Jesuit candidly published the reply:—“Your affairs,” said the prince, “embarrass me. I have read the charges against you. Your continual quarrels with the other Europeans, respecting the rites of China, have injured your cause immensely. What would you say, if,

¹ Apud Cretineau, v. 74.

² Ib. 76.

³ Ib. 77, 78, 79.

transporting ourselves to Europe, we were to do what you do here? Candidly, would you put up with it?" It was difficult to reply to that question.¹ So they had contented themselves, in their rejection as missionaries, with fulfilling their imperial duties as astronomers, mathematicians, annalists, geographers, physicians, painters and clockmakers—besides "sending to heaven" a great number of foundlings, not without danger of punishment from the Chinese Tribunal of Rites, which objected to this interference with the established process by metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls from one body to another after death.² About four-and-twenty years had passed in this fashion, three or four of which, according to Gaubil, were enough to ruin the mission completely. Everything tended to aggravate the proscription. The Chinese constantly dreaded the innovations that might be introduced by the men who came with a "national sanction" to promote the commercial views of Louis XIV.; the horrible reverses of the Church of Japan, connected with similar practices, as shall be presently related; the extirpation of the "Christian" religion in Tonquin; the interminable differences of the Christians among themselves; in fine, the striking fact, that the Dutch, Swedish, Danish, and English traders at Macao differed in religion with the Chinese Christians at Macao, though taught by Europeans—all these facts were ever present to the minds of the jealous, and shrewd, and reflecting Chinamen, when Benedict XIV.

¹ *Siècle de Louis XIV.*, p. 502.

² *Cretineau*, v. 80. The Jesuits thus convicted of baptising the foundlings were in danger of the law. Parrenin himself interceded in vain: but the Jesuit lay-brother, Castiglione, the emperor's *painter*, was successful, and the baptists were spared.—*Cretineau*, *ib.*

fulminated the last bull against the Chinese rites, which the lapse of four-and-twenty years had ripened again in the hot-bed of the missionary scheme. "After the Bull, *Ex illâ die*," said the pope to the Jesuits, "by which Clement XI. thought he had put an end to the disputes, it seemed just and proper that those who make special profession of obedience to the Holy See, should submit with humility and simplicity to that solemn decree, and it was not to be expected that we should see them creating new obstacles. Nevertheless, disobedient and specious men have thought of evading the prescriptions of the Bull, as though it were only a simple ecclesiastical precept, or else as though it had been weakened by certain permissions granted by the patriarch Mezzabarba, when he performed the functions of apostolic visitor in these countries." The terrible Bull, *Omnium sollicitudinum*, rushed forth as the exterminating angel of the mission. The clamours of envy or the sting of resisted authority—and the deference to public opinion in Europe—roused the popedom to an expedient interference in the equivocal method of the Jesuits. As philosophers, the latter defended their Chinese scheme of Christianity; and philosophically we are compelled to award them the glory of unlimited knowledge of the character and institutions of the pagans, on whom they would engraft the religion of Rome. Based on this undeniable foundation, they were, perhaps, more than a match for their opponents—their logic ought to have been triumphant—but they were condemned. On the former occasion they had made signs of resistance. "The men the most devoted to the authority of Rome," says Cretineau, "were about to wage against it a war for the settlement of evangelical


duties and moral principles : ”¹ but now, in the eventful epoch of crisis for the Company, they submitted to the papal mandate, which pronounced the doom of the China mission. And it was shattered to pieces, as the Jesuits predicted. The interference with their rites and ceremonies brought confusion and division among the people, and the laws of the empire marched forth in the usual Christian style in self-vindication. “As the Jesuits had foreseen,” says their latest historian, “their deference to the pontifical judgment was the signal of the fall of Christianity on the banks of the Hoang-ho and the Ganges. The missionaries were imprisoned, proscribed, or consigned to destruction.” Several Jesuits were put to death. The mandarins in the provinces, stimulated by the bonzas, joined in the reaction : the proscription spread like a conflagration.² Perhaps this consequence of the pope’s expedient measure attests the extent of the moral sacrifice, which those rites and ceremonies supposed in the Christianity of the mission, thus engrafted on Paganism ; if not, the papal court suffered the penalty awarded to those whose first and last desire is to “save appearances.” But it is highly honourable to the Chinamen that they confined their greatest severities to the *agents*, and did not extend them to the patients of the scheme : they seized and punished the teachers, and spared the misguided disciples. At Peking, however, the emperor kept his astronomers and diplomatists. The missionary scheme was expiring in China, as everywhere else : the Jesuits strove to place it under the safeguard of the sciences. “Honoured with the imperial favour as literary men, execrated as Catholic priests, they conformed to the conditions traced out for them by

¹ Cretineau, v. 50.² Id. ib. 83.

circumstances," says their latest historian. Father De Ventavon resided at the court in the capacity of mechanic to the emperor. The lay-brothers, Castiglione and Attiret, were his favourite painters. Father Hallerstein presided over the tribunal of the mathematics. Some of the Jesuits made clocks with moving figures; others applied to the fine arts, or the mechanical arts, for inventions that might be worthy to please Kiang-Loung: all tortured their wits to devise some means of averting the storm that growled over the heads of the Christians. Father Michael Benoît applied the principles of hydraulics. The spurting water, whose scientific management was as yet unknown in China, excited the applause of the emperor and his court. He desired to multiply the prodigy in his gardens, and Benoît was charged with the direction of the works. He thus gained frequent opportunities of seeing the emperor, in order to overcome his prejudices against the Christians and Europeans. Benoît set to the work: he did more, with the same good intention,—he studied the art of engraving in copper: he trained artists, and produced engravings. He initiated the emperor in the use of the telescope and the mystery of the air-pump. On the 23rd of October, 1774, Benoît succumbed under his labours. An artist by day, in order to be able during the night to fortify the perseverance of his catechumens, he died, to the regret of the emperor and that of the Jesuits. Fathers D'Arocha and Sikelpoort were the last props of that mission. In generous but barren efforts, the Jesuits exhausted their energies. At Tonquin, in the Madura, in Cochin China, the Fathers Alvarez, D'Abreu, and D'Acunha, fell under the sword of the executioner; and others, wandering hopeless, abandoned

by their flocks, beheld their hard-wrought missions crumbling to pieces, and vanishing into nought at the very time when the Company of Jesus was hurrying to her final crisis—the penumbra of fatal eclipse fringing the satellite of Rome.¹

The Dominicans, who took up the Chinese mission with reformed rigidity, only made a few fanatical martyrs, molested the nation—and then there was an end of that “Christianity.”² Neither Matteo Ricci



nor Adam Schall would have made martyrs of the Chinamen. These Jesuits and their learned followers evidently had a favourable notion of the Chinese

¹ Cretineau, v. 83, *et seq.*

² Four Dominicans were put to death, with a bishop of the same Order, and Pope Benedict had the satisfaction of pronouncing an eulogy “on the precious death of this holy bishop,” thus “sent to heaven” by the horns of his bull.—*Butler, Martyrs of China*, Feb. 5. The Dominicans entered China as early as 1556, and by 1631 “had converted the great part of the province of Fokien to the faith.”—*Butler, ibid.* The Dominicans made “martyrs,” but the Jesuits in China contented themselves with attesting their ceaseless industry and talents—the best kind of martyrdom unquestionably.

religious system—as may be evident from the subjoined figure of one of their altars lately discovered at Shanghai. It certainly very emphatically attests the extent to which the accommodating Jesuits ingrafted their religion on that of the pagans—on their very altar of sacrifice uniting the heathen symbol of the Dragon, and the Spirit of Fire, with the Cross, the I.H.S. and nails of the Company.¹

In no part of the world did the Jesuits achieve such success as in Japan ; at all events, in their own numerical results. Judge from their asserted fact, that from 1603 to 1622, they converted exactly 239,339 Japanese ; and seven years after they numbered upwards of 400,000. Every encouragement had been granted them by this very tolerant nation : they availed themselves of the fact, and flourished accordingly. United to the Portuguese they made commerce subservient to the scheme of reducing the whole country to the faith, apparently with the view of establishing a thoroughly Romish dynasty in the East, or in order to effectuate such a majority of partisans in the country, as would easily transfer the kingdom to Spain. The traders of Portugal, then subject to Spain, were bound by an oath not to trade with any natives but such as were Christians—a curious invention to influence the cupidity of the nation, particularly as the commerce of the Portuguese was a source of certain wealth.

¹ This altar now stands in a cottage near Shanghai, one of the five Chinese ports opened to foreigners by the treaty lately concluded between the Chinese and the British. The drawing was taken by the Rev. T. M'Catchie, one of the two missionaries sent by the Church Missionary Society to China. Mr. M'Catchie remarks that one of the most prominent objects in the altar is the heathen symbol of the dragon, adopted in order to gain converts.—*From the Church Missionary Paper*, No. cxxiii. 1846.

Meanwhile the Jesuits had gained great influence with the people ; and it was on the increase, in spite of occasional hostile demonstrations on the part of the nobles. The bonzas were, of course, sworn foes of their rivals in influence : but the increasing multitude of the Christians was a source of anxiety to the emperor of Japan. An unprincipled Dutchman fired this reasonable anxiety into desperate execution. The oath exacted from the Portuguese to trade only with “ Christians,” had operated unto “ conversions ” so generally, that the Dutch heretic-traders found themselves shunned by the natives, who, besides the bond of the faith, were longer acquainted with the Portuguese, and, moreover, discovered by experience that they were more honourable traders than the Dutch. The president of the Dutch Company in Japan resolved to ruin the credit of the Portuguese with the government : he forged a letter in Portuguese, detailing the plan of a general insurrection among the Christians of Japan, against the emperor. This document was duly conveyed to the emperor, accompanied with representations still more calculated to exasperate his growing mistrust of the Christians. Unfortunately the Jesuits themselves accelerated the coming thunderbolt.¹

The fathers had converted one of the Japanese nobles and his family : his youngest son was under the care of the Jesuits, in their seminary. The Jesuits persuaded this nobleman to give them one of his houses for the use of the catechumens. They subsequently cured one of his children : he redoubled his favours to them,—but died soon after, when his eldest sons, at the court, demanded the restoration of the house in question, from

¹ Tavernier, *Voyages, Relation du Japon* ; *Morale Pratique*, ii. 270, *et seq.*

the Jesuits. By the law of the land they could claim the tenement, as a father was not permitted to alienate his property to the prejudice of his children. The Jesuits refused to surrender the donation. The inheritors appealed to the emperor, already suspicious of the Jesuits and their Christians : the Dutchmen aggravated the incident,—gave them the forged letter before mentioned ; they showed it to the emperor. Roused to action by the supposed plot in contemplation, he forthwith commanded the extirpation of the Portuguese and the native Christians.¹

Their concealed partisans at the court notified the impending calamity, and the Christians were roused to defend their lives and *their* innocence in the approaching assault. Two noblemen headed the devoted victims—an army of 40,000 men and upwards. An imperial army was sent forth to crush the rebels : the Christians made representations to the emperor, protesting their readiness to throw down their arms, if their sovereign would consent to listen to their defence. One of the Christian leaders volunteered to be the bearer of the letter to the imperial general : he was seized and hanged in the sight of the Christians, who were forthwith attacked with impetuosity. The two armies were actually commanded by brothers—the sons of the nobleman who gave the calamitous house to the Jesuits. In the deadliest of the strife, the imperial leaders sought out their Christian brothers, whilst the latter strove to avoid their unnatural antagonists. Fierce and desperate was the struggle of the Christians : they outflanked and then surrounded the enemy, whom they routed with terrible slaughter. The utter extermination

¹ Tavernier, *ubi suprâ*.

of the Christians was then resolved. Another engagement ensued, and the Christians were again victorious, but with incalculable loss on both sides ; for the emperor had commanded that no quarter should be given to the vanquished. In a third battle the idolaters were routed. Numbers were then poured upon them on all sides,—their general was killed,—they were defeated, and cut to pieces.

Then began that frightful persecution which has no parallel in history, if all its horrors be facts. The Christians were crucified in such a manner as to prolong life, whilst horrible torments were applied to compel apostacy. Every variety of slaughter was applied to the extermination of the Christians. In a work published by the Jesuits, in Europe, during the persecution in Japan, they have given engravings of all these horrible methods, just as they did with regard to the persecution in England ; and as the representations of the latter were manifest exaggerations, we may trust that the persecution in Japan, though awfully conclusive in its result, was attended with only half the atrocities detailed by the Jesuits,—such as bruising the feet of the Christians between logs of wood,—cutting off or squeezing their limbs one after another,—applying red-hot irons or slow fires,—flaying off the skin of the fingers,—putting burning coals to their hands,—tearing off the flesh with pincers, or thrusting reeds into all parts of their bodies, until they should consent to forsake their faith : all which, innumerable persons, say the Jesuits, and even children, bore with invincible constancy till death. The elaborate Jesuit production, by Father Trigault, entitled “The Triumph of the Martyrs of Japan,” with frightful, but somewhat

ridiculous engravings, published in 1623, seems to have been the source of all other accounts of the persecution, written by Protestants or Catholics.¹

¹ The Latin title of the work is *De Christianis apud Japonios Triumphis*, &c. Monachii, 1623. "I do not intend," says Tavernier, "to enter into the details of these various modes of martyrdom :—there are many special narratives in which those writers, in order to do honour to their Company, have introduced many fabulous particulars : but even to judge from the facts stated by the Dutch themselves, it would be true to say that the Church never suffered, in so short a time, so cruel a persecution." The Church of Rome has appointed a day in their Saints' Calendar, to honour the memory of "the martyrs of Japan," and "the martyrs of China"—all of them contributions either by the Jesuits or Pope Benedict XIV.,—with the usual blasphemous incrimination of "Divine Providence," and the "permission" of God Almighty. It seems that heaven, as well as earth, must be ruled and regulated by the whims and pernicious notions of "religious people" who, in all times since the Reformation, will meddle with the concerns of distant nations ;—striving to force upon them that religion which, if it were purely practised among them, would need no societies nor propaganda to induce its reception ; but which, in the universal system adopted, only serves to perpetuate affliction, and tax the credulous subscribers of Europe—whilst hungry and naked fellow-Christians cry for a helping hand around us. I cannot believe that Heaven approves of any of those rival schemes and speculations—necessarily abortive by the fact so evident to the heathen, that their would-be teachers and leaders to heaven, consign each other to the opposite place merely for differing in articles of the very faith which is promulgated as *the* Christianity. Christians should agree among themselves before they attempt to unsettle the minds of the pagans. They should, moreover, reflect on all that the pagan must change in his manners and customs before he can be a Christian. In this matter *halves* will not do : he is perhaps a much more acceptable man to his Creator, as a pagan, than as a half-christian, or such as missionaries "report" annually, and boast of in their "Propagation Annals." It is all very fine for devotees to read these wretched romances : but when we put questions to travellers, and converse with those who habitually visit the scenes of the alleged triumphs of faith, bitter convictions ensue, and we are compelled to believe that Jesuitism is universal.

By Xavier's own account, it is evident that the bonzas of Japan were a match for the missioner in argumentation ; and in the *Conferences between the Danish Missionaries*, &c., p. 341, there is a letter from a heathen to one of these missionaries, wherein the heathen gives the reasons why the Indians reject the Christian religion. "You are much astonished," says the heathen, "at our infidelity. But give us leave to tell you, that you have not sufficiently proved our law to be false, and altogether erroneous ; nor so clearly and evidently proved the truth of your own, that we should inconsiderately change the religion of our fathers, for that of foreigners and sojourners in our land. For, I would have you know, that as the Christians and Mohammedans derive their laws from God,—

One of the Jesuits, Ferreyra, abjured the faith to escape death, and was raised to preside over one of the tribunals for making martyrs. Five Jesuits were subsequently brought before him. "Who are you?" he asked. "Priests of the Company of Jesus," was the reply. "Abjure your faith," said the renegade, "and you shall be rich and raised to honour." But these Jesuits intimated that "martyrdom" was their object,—and they died accordingly. It is said that Ferreyra repented in his old age, recanted his recantation, and died a martyr; but this may be only an invention to save the credit of the Company.¹

Nowhere else was such a decisive destruction of the mission scheme effected. It had lived a century, and perished utterly in 1649. It perished by the same method which the Jesuits recommended in Germany for the destruction of Protestantism—namely, by the secular arm. Père La Chaise and Louis XIV. did the same, as far as possible, with the Huguenots of France.

so do we :—for certainly, you cannot imagine that we hammered and forged a religion to ourselves, any more than you did yourselves. The Mohammedan will have his religion to be absolutely the best: the Christians condemn all but themselves; and we Malabarians think our religion to be the best for us; and question not but that the Christians may be saved, if they lead lives conformable to the precepts of their religion. Which is the best religion, is a difficult task to know; for even among ourselves we have many different opinions,—some affirming that Brahma is the supreme God, others stand up for Vishnu; and there are as many learned men who plead for the God Shiva; and I think 'tis prudence not to trouble myself with the truth or falsity of your religion, till I first know which is the truest of the many opinions relating to religion that we entertain here among ourselves." Lockman very candidly asks hereupon: "Would it have been possible for an European, who had gone through a regular course of education, to have answered more pertinently?" The reply is, Decidedly not—but instead of such an answer, a volley of clap-trap controversy, or misinterpreted texts from the Bible, would be the prelude to rancorous denunciation as a heretic, infidel, deist, atheist,—if we be not "converted." For the above letter, see Lockman's *Travels of the Jesuits*, i. 430, note.

¹ Cretineau, iii. 203, *et seq.*

The only difference was, that the Japanese authorities thought that their reign was at stake in the increase of the proselytes : and there is no positive proof to the contrary. The persecution swelled the martyrology of Rome : but the Jesuit Solier nevertheless excessively blames the violence of the Japanese ; and a certain abbé, in his History of the Japanese Church, “wonders at the depth of God’s judgments, that He should have permitted the blood of so many martyrs to be shed, without its having served, as in the first ages of the Christian Church, as a fruitful seed for the forming or producing new Christians.”¹ “Without presuming to inquire into the reasons which the Divine Wisdom may have for permitting at one time what it does not permit at another, it may be said that the Christianity of the sixteenth century had no right to hope for the same favour, and the same protection from God, as the Christianity of the three first centuries. The latter was a benign, gentle, and patient religion, which recommended to subjects submission to their sovereigns, and did not endeavour to raise itself to the throne by rebellions. But the Christianity which was preached to the infidels of the sixteenth century, was very different :—it was a bloody, murderous religion, which had been used to slaughter for five or six hundred years. It had contracted a very long habit of maintaining and aggrandising itself, by putting to the sword all who resisted it. Fines, executions, the dreadful tribunal of the Inquisition, crusades, bulls exciting subjects to rebellion, seditious preachers, conspiracies, assassinations of princes, were the ordinary methods employed against those who refused submission to its

¹ Journal des Savans, 1689 ; Bayle, vi. 365 [F].

orders. Could these Christians promise themselves the blessing which Heaven had granted the primitive Church, to the gospel of peace, patience, and gentleness? The best choice the Japanese had to make was, to become converts to the true God; but not having knowledge sufficient to renounce their false religion, they then had no other choice to make but an active or passive persecution. They could not preserve their ancient government nor their ancient worship, but by getting rid of the Christians. These, one time or other, would have destroyed both: they would have armed all their new converts, would have introduced into Japan the soldiers and cruel maxims of the Spaniards, and, by hanging and slaughtering, as in *America*, would have enslaved all Japan. Thus, to consider things only in a political view, it must be confessed that the persecution which the Christians suffered in that country was a prudent means to prevent the overthrow of the monarchy, and plundering of a state. The ingenuous confession of a Spaniard justifies the precautions which these infidels took to insure their independence:—it furnished the bonzas with a specious pretence for exercising their hatred, and soliciting the extirpation of the Christians. “Being asked by the King of Tossa, how the King of Spain got possession of so great an extent of country in both hemispheres, the Spaniard answered too frankly, that he used to send friars to preach the gospel to foreign nations; and that after having converted a considerable number of heathens, he used to send his forces, which, joining with the new converts to Christianity, by that means conquered the country. The Christians paid dearly for this indiscreet confession.”¹

¹ Bayle, vi. 365 [E]. The Spaniard's confession is from the *Hist. des Ouvrages des Savans*, Sept. 1691, p. 13, 14.

The four hundred thousand proselytes of the Jesuits, after swelling the martyrology with considerable contributions, became safe subjects of the emperor of Japan ; and the most effectual means were taken to secure them for the future. At the commencement of every year the search after Christians was renewed, and all the heads of families and individuals of the nation had to sign a declaration, not only that they were not Christians, but also that they knew of no Christian, and that they abhorred and detested Christianity as a religion hostile to the state.¹ From this contemplation let us turn to a field more admirable.

By the first years of the eighteenth century, the French Jesuits had penetrated far and wide the continent of North America, and the memory of the “Black Robes,” as they were called, was destined long to linger in the hearts of the Indians. “On some moss-grown tree they pointed out the traces of their work, and in wonder the traveller deciphered, carved side by side on its trunk, the emblem of our salvation and the lilies of the Bourbons. Amid the snows of Hudson’s Bay—among

¹ Tavernier, *ut antea*. In the *Morale Pratique des Jesuites*, ii. there are copious details respecting the conduct of the Jesuits in China and Japan. It will there be evident that the usual troubles and divisions existed between them and the other missionaries. Ineffectual complaints to the pope had been made from time to time, but the Jesuits continued their vexations. The end of the scheme was like its progress. “In Japan,” says M. Martin (*Voyage de Duquesne*, t. iii. 84) “the persecution caused by the fault of the Jesuits, has so effectually banished Christianity, that no one can there be received before he has thrown down and trampled upon a crucifix. . . . The Jesuits, unwilling to resign their hold in the country, or to give up their commerce in that empire, still continue their visits, and perform the ceremony of trampling upon the crucifix ; they pretend that they only insult the metal, without ceasing to respect the object it represents”—the *recta intentio* of the casuists. M. Martin affirms the fact as undeniable, on the authority of persons on the spot. It is also stated in the *Supplement aux Reflexions d’un Portugais* (No. 99). See *Hist. abrégée des Jesuites*, ii. 89, *et seq.*

the woody islands and beautiful inlets of the St. Lawrence—by the Council-fires of the Hurons and the Algonquins—at the sources of the Mississippi, where, first of the white men, their eyes looked upon the Falls of St. Anthony, and then traced down the course of the bounding river, as it rushed onward to earn its title of ‘Father of Waters,’—on the vast prairies of Illinois and Missouri—among the blue hills which hem in the salubrious dwellings of the Cherokees, and in the thick cane-brakes of Louisiana—everywhere were found the members of the ‘Society of Jesus.’ Marquette, Joliet, Brebeuf, Jogues, Lallemand, Rasles, and Marest, are the names which the West should ever hold in remembrance. But it was only by suffering and trial that these early labourers won their triumphs. Many of them too were men who had stood high in camps and courts, and could contrast their desolate state in the solitary wigwam with the refinement and affluence which had waited on their early years. But now all these were gone. Home, the love of kindred, the golden ties of relationship, all were to be forgotten by these stern and high-wrought men, and they were often to go forth into the wilderness, without an adviser on their way, save their God. Through long and sorrowful years they were obliged to ‘sow in tears’ before they could ‘reap in joy.’ Every self-denial gathered around them which could wear upon the spirit and cause the heart to fail. Mighty forests were to be threaded on foot, and the great lakes of the West passed in the feeble bark canoe. Hunger, and cold, and disease, were to be encountered, until nothing but the burning zeal within could keep alive the wasted and sinking frame. But worse than all were those spiritual evils which forced

them to weep and pray in darkness. They had to endure the contradiction of those they came to save, who often, after listening for months with apparent interest, so that the Jesuit began to hope they would soon be numbered with his converts, suddenly quitted him with cold and derisive words, and turned again to the superstitions of their tribe. Most of them, too, were martyrs to their faith. Few of their number 'died the common death of men,' or slept at last in the grounds which their church had consecrated. Some, like Jogues, and Du Poisson, and Souel, sank beneath the blows of the infuriated savages, and their bodies were thrown out to feed the vulture, whose shriek, as he flapped his wings above them, had been their only requiem. Others, like Brebeuf, and Lallemand, and Sanat, died at the stake, and their ashes 'flew no marble tells us whither,' while the dusky sons of the forest stood around, and mingled their wild yells of triumph with the martyr's dying prayers. Others, again, like the aged Marquette, sinking beneath years of toil, fell asleep in the wilderness, and their sorrowing companions dug their graves in the green turf, where for many years the rude forest-ranger stopped to invoke their names, and bow in prayer before the cross which marked the sacred spot. But did these things stop the progress of the Jesuits? The sons of Loyola never retreated. The mission they founded in a tribe ended only with the extinction of the tribe itself. Their lives were made up of fearless devotedness and heroic self-sacrifice. Though sorrowing for the dead, they pressed forward at once to occupy their places, and, if needs be, share their fate. 'Nothing,' wrote Father Le Petit, after describing the martyrdom of two of his

brethren—‘nothing has happened to these two excellent missionaries for which they were not prepared when they devoted themselves to the Indian missions.’ If the flesh trembled, the spirit seemed never to falter. Each one, indeed, felt that he was ‘baptised for the dead,’ and that his own blood, poured out in the mighty forests of the west, would bring down perhaps greater blessings on those for whom he died than he could win for them by the labours of a life. He realised that he was ‘appointed unto death.’ ‘*Ibo, et non redibo*—I will go, and will not return,’ were the prophetic words of Father Jogues, when, for the last time, he departed to the Mohawks. When Lallemand was bound to the stake, and for seventeen hours his excruciating agonies were prolonged, his words of encouragement to his companion were—‘Brother! we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.’ When Marquette was setting out for the sources of the Mississippi, and the friendly Indians who had known him wished to turn him from his purpose, by declaring ‘that those distant nations never spared the strangers,’ the calm reply of the missionary was—‘I shall gladly lay down my life for the salvation of souls.’ And then the red sons of the wilderness bowed with him in prayer, and before the simple cross of cedar, and among the stately groves of elm and maple which line the St. Lawrence, there arose that old chant which the aged man had been accustomed to hear in the distant cathedrals of his own land :—

‘Vexilla Regis prodeunt—
Fulget Crucis mysterium.’¹

¹ “The banners of Heaven’s King advance,
The mystery of the Cross shines forth.”

But how little is known of all these men ! The history of their bravery and suffering, touching as it is, has been comparatively neglected.”¹

Such is an American Protestant’s delightful description of the Jesuit-mission in North America, as deduced from the *Edifying and Curious Letters*, which he has translated and published “as a contribution to the historical records of his country.” The following very graphic, and very interesting narrative of a Jesuit missionary in Georgia, completes the picture. “Permit me,” writes a correspondent to the London Magazine of 1760, “permit me to give the world some particulars of a son of Loyola, which will prove that Society’s attempts to found Jesuit-Commonwealths, have not been confined to South America ; but that they intended also to extend their sway over the copper-coloured tribes of the northern part of the Continent, and, perhaps, the seeds of disgust sowed amongst the Cherokees and Creeks, at the time I am about to mention, may have had a more baneful effect than it could, at that time, enter into the wisest heads to conceive.

“When the brave and worthy General Oglethorpe commanded in Georgia, and, by his extensive influence over the Indian nations around that colony, kept them in friendship and subjection to this crown ; and in March, 1743, whilst he, with a detachment of his indefatigable regiment, and a large body of Indians, was making an incursion to the very gates of St. Augustine, one *Preber, a German Jesuit*, as he afterwards appeared to be, was sent prisoner to Frederica, by Captain Kent, who commanded at Fort Augusta-on-the-Main. Captain Kent had, for some time before, perceived a remarkable

¹ The Rev. William Ingraham Kip. *The Early Jesuit Missions*, i. *Preface*.

intractability in the Creek Indians, in matters of trade, and a sulkiness in that generous nation, which betokened no good to the English. After a wise and secret inquiry, and from proper intelligence, he had great reason to suspect some ill-humours were stirred up in these people, by a white man, who had resided some time in the upper towns, after having been many years amongst the Cherokees, who always showed him the utmost deference. Upon these advices he got him privately seized, and conveyed, without noise or bustle, to Frederica, little imagining the importance of his capture ; though the Indians, missing him, made it very apparent by their clamours, that they were not a little interested in his safety. The general, at his return, was surprised, upon examination, to find in this prisoner, who appeared in his dress a perfect Indian, a man of politeness and gentility, who spoke Latin, French, Spanish, and German fluently, and English brokenly. What passed at his several examinations I am unable to say ; but the consequence was that he was detained a prisoner, and so remained when I left the colony, at the beginning of the year 1744, which was after his Excellency returned to England.

“Preber, as to his person, was a short, dapper man, with a pleasing, open countenance, and a most penetrating look. His dress was a deer-skin jacket, a flap before and behind, with *morgissons*, or deer-skin pumps or sandals, which were laced in the Indian manner, on his feet and ancles. The place of his confinement was the barracks, where he had a room, and a sentry at his door day and night. The philosophical ease with which he bore his confinement, the communicative disposition he seemed possessed of, and his politeness, which his

dress and imprisonment could not disguise, attracted the notice of every gentleman at Frederica, and gained him the favour of many visits and conversations.

“His economy was admirable. From his allowance of fish, flesh, and bread, he always spared, until he had by him a quantity on which he could regale, even with gluttony, when he allowed himself that liberty. ‘It is folly,’ he would say, ‘to repine at one’s lot in life. My mind soars above misfortune : in this cell I can enjoy more real happiness than it is possible to do in the busy scenes of life. Reflections upon past events, digesting former studies, keep me fully employed, whilst health and abundant spirits allow me no anxious, no uneasy moments. I suffer—though a friend to the natural rights of mankind—though an enemy to tyranny, usurpation, and oppression—and, what is more, I can forgive and pray for those that injure me. I am a Christian, and Christian principles always promote internal felicity.’

“Sentiments like these, often expressed, attracted my particular notice, and I endeavoured to cultivate a confidence which he seemed to repose in me, more especially, by every kind office in my power. Indeed, had nothing else been my reward, the pleasing entertainment his conversation imparted, would have been a sufficient recompense. He had read much, was conversant in most arts and sciences ; but in all greatly wedded to system and hypothesis.

“After some months’ intercourse, I had, from his own mouth, a confession of his designs in America, which were neither more nor less than to bring about a confederation amongst all the Southern Indians, to inspire them with industry, to instruct them in the arts

necessary to the commodity of life ; and, in short, to engage them to throw off the yoke of their European allies, of all nations. For this purpose he had, for many years, accommodated himself to their opinions, prejudices, and practices, had been their leader in war, and their priest and legislator in peace, interlarding (like his brethren in China) some of the most alluring Romish rites with their own superstitions, and inculcating such maxims of policy as were not utterly repugnant to their own, and yet were admirably calculated to subserve the views he had upon them. Hence they began already to be more acute in their dealings with the English and French, and to look down upon those nations as interlopers, and invaders of their just rights. The Spaniards, I found, he looked upon with a more favourable eye. ‘They,’ said he, ‘are good Christians, that is (with a smiling sneer) such subjects as may be worked upon to do anything for the sake of converting their neighbours : with *them* my people would incorporate and become one nation—a bull, a breve, a dispensation will bring them to anything.’

“When I hinted at the bloodshed which his scheme would produce, the difficulties he had to encounter, and the many years it would require to establish this government over the Indians, he answered in this remarkable manner : ‘Proceeding properly, many of these evils may be avoided ; and, as to length of time, we have a succession of agents to take up the work as fast as others leave it. We never lose sight of a favourite point—nor are we bound by the strict rules of morality, in the means, when the end we pursue is laudable. If we err, our general is to blame, and we

have a merciful God to pardon us. But, believe me—before the century is past, *the Europeans will have a very small footing on this continent.*

“Thus, the Father, or nearly in these words, expressed himself, and often hinted that there were many more of his brethren who were yet labouring amongst the Indians for the same purposes.

“The adventures of this remarkable man were extraordinary : — at present, I shall conclude this letter with one striking instance of his presence of mind and fortitude.

“On the 22nd of March, 1744, the large magazine of bombs, and a small magazine of powder, at Frederica, by some accident were set on fire and blew up with a dreadful explosion. In a moment the town wore all the appearance of a bombardment, the inhabitants left their houses, and fled with the utmost consternation into the adjacent woods and savannahs, whilst splinters of the bursting shells flew in the air to an amazing distance, considering they were not projected from the usual instruments of destruction. The worthy and humane Captain Mackay, who then commanded in the garrison, immediately opened the doors of the prisons to all the captive Spaniards and Indians, and bade them shift for themselves. A message was sent to Preber to the same purpose, which he politely refused to comply with, and in the hurry, he was soon forgotten. The bombs were well bedded as it providentially happened, and, starting at intervals, were some hours in discharging themselves. When the explosion began to languish, some of us thought of the Jesuit, and went to his apartment, which, by the way, was not twenty paces from the bomb-house. After calling some time, he put forth his

head from under his feather-bed, with which he had prudently covered himself, and cried, ‘Gentlemen, I suppose all’s over :—for my part, I reasoned thus : The bombs will rise perpendicularly, and, if the fusee fails, will fall again in the same direction, but the splinters will fly off horizontally :—therefore, with this trusty covering, I thought I had better stand the storm here, than hazard a knock on the pate by flying further ?’ This was said with the same ease that he would have expressed himself at a banquet, and he continued the conversation with his usual vein of pleasantry, to the end of an explosion that was enough to strike terror into the firmest breast.”¹

Whilst this interesting Indian-Jesuit, with his band of “patriots,” was agitating the North of the Continent, their brethren in the South were rapidly carrying out the scheme—as they thought, with every hope of final achievement. Such, however, was not destined to chance. In the very system of the Paraguay reductions there was elemental decay. Under the practical fallacy of “Community of goods,” the labour-wealth of the Indians enriched the Company whose slaves they were ;—their minds being made to acquiesce in that “indifference to all things” which was the devotional theory inculcated by the Jesuits. The Indians were indifferent to property ; and the fathers farmed the produce of their ceaseless toil. What filial respect could exist under the system of espionage and rebuke, which the Jesuits applied to the government of the people, we are at a loss to discover. They forced marriages upon the Indians, seldom leaving the parties to choose for themselves ; they thus produced the natural consequence of

¹ London Magazine, Sept. 1760, p. 443, *et seq.*

indifference between man and wife. The Indian husbands were indifferent towards their wives, the wives towards their husbands, both towards their children, and these towards their parents ; but all were bound to the Jesuits. For the Jesuits they lived ; in them they had their being. An important result ensued. It was a notorious fact, that the population tended to a natural decrease : the rapidity of new accessions concealed the fact for a time ; but at the period of their most flourishing condition, the fact forced itself to the notice of the Jesuits, who thought they could, as in everything else, devise a method for mechanically promoting what they naturally hindered.¹

The “perfect equality” enforced was, perhaps, one of the most active elements of internal decay. Man’s lowest instincts might, for a time, relish such a state of things ;

¹ This extraordinary Jesuit-method to promote the increase of population, is stated by Doblas, governor of the province of “Conception,” one of the missions, in 1781. The following is a Latin translation of the curious passage, by Mr. Robertson (Letters, ii. 79, note): “Cum audirem,” says Doblas, “horis diversis noctù, tympanum pulsari, et præcipuè ad auroram exorientem, inquisivi quorsum hic sonitus ? Dixerunt mihi, semper consuetum esse totam gentem, secundum quietem, crebrò suscitare : hujus usus originem cognoscere volenti, responderunt mihi, propter notam indolem desidiosam Indorum, qui, labore quotidiano defessi, ineunt lectum, et per noctem totam dormiunt—hoc modo *officiis conjugilibus non functis*—Jesuitas mandasse nonnullis horis noctù, tympanum pulsari hoc modo *incitare maritos*.” I have taken the liberty partially to correct the translation, which is still, however, not what the Jesuits would have given, had they mentioned this strange device in their annual letters. The original is in the *Memoria sobre las Misiones*, published at Buenos Ayres in 1836, by Don Pedro de Angelis. Speaking of Doblas, who was governor of the “Conception” in 1781, Mr. Robertson says : “This was only fourteen years after the expulsion of the Jesuits ; so that the governor had the best opportunity for obtaining correct information. The acuteness of his mind, the simplicity of his narrative, and the impartiality of his judgment, all render him, in my opinion, one of the best authorities, and most entertaining writers on the *Misiones*. The narrative of what he observed is lamentably correct and amusing ; but his well-intentioned suggestions for amelioration were speculative and impracticable.”—*Letters on Paraguay*, ii. 71, note.

but force would finally be necessary to maintain it in vigour,—for it assumes a moral stagnation, of which there is no example in nature—excepting in death, which, after all, is but another state of elemental agitation.

Now the fine fanciful description of the Paraguay Indians in their holiday-attire for exhibition, however necessary it may be to copy it in a history of the Jesuits, still needs correction. “One of the greatest points with the Jesuits,” says Doblas, “perhaps the greatest point, was to keep up a perfect equality among all the Indians, as well in matters of dress, as in regular attendance at work : so that the lord and lady-mayoreess were required to be the first at the spot selected for that day’s labour, and they were there joined by the other workmen :—thus it was also with the aldermen and their wives. Not one of them was allowed to wear shoes—nor any distinctive badge of clothing—not even to vary the general mode of wearing what they had :—all were put upon a footing of perfect equality. The only distinction conceded to the lord mayor and aldermen was a permission, on days of public festivity, to carry their black wands, and to dress in suits kept by the fathers under lock and key, expressly for such occasions, and for those only. The caciques, or *natural chiefs*, were generally the most miserable of the whole community, and very rare it was to find one of them who could read. They never gave them any public office, or, if they did, it was on occasions few and far between. It was shown, at the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits, that there were found only three cacique mayors in the thirty reductions. No doubt the fathers feared that if they added to the veneration entertained

by the people for their caciques, by conferring on them honourable offices, they might aspire to more authority than was at that time altogether convenient. . . . The consequences of this régime could be hidden neither from the curates nor their superiors ; but their private interests occupied the place of first importance in all they did ; and thus they adopted a method of their own, the grand object of which was to keep the Indians aloof from every thing that could tend to rescue them from ignorance and degradation. When men acted upon this régime, and upon these principles of political economy, it cannot be matter of surprise, that, in the course of a hundred and fifty years, the period since these establishments were formed, such immense wealth should have been found in the churches, as in that fund called ‘the fund of the community.’ For my part, I am not astonished at this, when I consider the vast fertility of this province ; the complete subjugation of the Indians ; that they were absolutely shut out from all intercourse with the Spaniards ; and that, knowing no other authority than that of the Jesuits, they became mere tools in their hands.”

Property was rendered a dead-weight and embarrassment to the Indians. “Suppose an Indian, not spell-bound by the impressions made on his countrymen, as a result of their training and education : suppose such an Indian to be of an active laborious disposition : suppose that, stimulated by a spirit of industry, as well as by the advantages accorded to him by his township, of a free grant of arable land, and of bullocks to plough it, — he desires, by working on the days allowed him by “the Community” for this purpose, to make the fertility of the soil subservient to the amelioration of his

condition in life. Well, he ploughs up and prepares a large space of land, and sows it with such seeds as he knows will yield him the largest return of produce. The year is propitious ; and in due season, after much personal labour and pains—because he has not been able to hire the labourers of “the community” to assist him—because his wife, being also employed by “the community,” cannot help him—and because he himself is obliged to labour the half of his time for “the community,”—yet, in due season, he reaps a crop three or four times greater than he requires for the maintenance of himself and family, during the whole year. Now, what is he to do with the *surplus* of this crop ? Sell it to others ? Who *are* these others ? The Indians of his own town, or of other towns ? And these Indians, what are *they* to give him in exchange for his produce ? They have nothing of their own, except some grain or vegetables precisely the same of which the industrious Indian has already too much. He cannot export his produce from the province, either because he has not the means, or because the expense of doing so would exceed the return. Seeing now the failure he has made the first year, but still unwilling to live in idleness, the Indian, instead of sowing grain, determines the second year to plant cotton, sugar-cane, and tobacco—because he knows that cotton, sugar, and tobacco are all articles of commerce. He puts his design in execution, and sees his crops all thriving. The cotton-plant and sugar-cane yield no produce, or very little, the first year ; and for the tobacco, it is necessary, from the moment it begins to ripen till it is completely seasoned, and made ready for sale, not to leave it for an instant. But our industrious and enterprising Indian must at this very time

give his labour to "the community." So the tobacco which he has gathered in on the days allowed him, is lost during those on which he must serve the fathers ; and in the end he collects nothing, or, if he does get a little, it is of bad quality. In the following year, when he had expected to reap some benefit from his cotton and sugar-cane plantations, he is sent off as a herd to the *estancias*, as a *peon* to the yerba-plantations, or as something else to some other place, in which he is constrained to remain for some time. His whole labour has been in vain : he goes—he must go—wherever he is commanded ; and all on which he had placed his hope is abandoned, and all on which he had set his heart is lost. Cattle the Indian could neither possess nor breed—because, in consequence of his continually-required services to "the community," he cannot herd them, and because all the other Indians, being subject to similar regulations, he can hire no man as a substitute."¹

If American slavery be a desirable régime for men, then the Jesuit-régime in Paraguay may be deemed a model for governments. Accordingly, it required the utmost vigilance to keep it in its integrity, if the term can be applied to the system. One superior general presided as monarch over all the *Missiones*. He resided at Candilaria, as being a central point, from which he could readily visit the other establishments around him. He had two vice-superiors or lieutenants, under him, one on the banks of the Paraná, the other on those of the Uruguay. In addition to these functionaries, who conducted the more important business of "the community," each township had its own curate or *paî*, assisted

¹ Doblas, *Memoria sobre las Misiones*, apud Robertson, *Letters on Paraguay*, ii. p. 70, *et seq.*

by another priest, and sometimes two, as I have stated, according to its extent and population. The curates superintended the spiritual and temporal affairs—one ministering at the altar, and teaching the neophytes to read and write; the other presiding over the agricultural department, the herding of the cattle, and the tradesmen.¹

Though the civil government of the Indians was nominally vested in themselves, it was really in the hands of the curate or paî. Without the consent of this personage, not one single thing could be done. The court of Common Council, as it were, met every day; gave in their report to the omnipotent paî, and receiving his instructions as to what they should do, proceeded to give them rigid fulfilment.²

It remains for us now to see whether all this trouble of the Jesuits was worth their while, in a pecuniary point of view—in other words, whether the speculation “paid.”

“No Jesuit ever took in hand
To plant a Church in barren land.”

There were no mines of gold in Paraguay: but there was a mine of labour—perhaps the best, and in the long run, most profitable mine in the economy of Providence.

“As for the property possessed by the Jesuits, great as it was, it has, I am convinced, always been underrated; and for this reason, that those who made the estimates, never took into account *the value of the Indians*. In the Indians consisted the chief wealth; and from their labour was derived, it may be said, the sum total of the revenue of the mission-establishments. To overlook this point is to misconceive the whole matter.

¹ Robertson, Letters, ii. 69.

² *Ubi suprà*, p. 70.

“There were a 100,000 Indian inhabitants in the missions, including men, women, and children. I value them at 40*l.* a-head, on this principle:—supposing only 30,000 of these to be working men, and that they earned only 20*l.* a-year, each; and of which 10*l.* went for their own subsistence and clothing, and 10*l.* to ‘the community’ of the Jesuits, these men earned, by the labour of their slaves, 300,000*l.* per annum: that is, the clear gain arising from the labour of 30,000 working men at 10*l.* each, being 300,000*l.* Now, if you take the whole Indian population at a 100,000, and value them, as property, at 40*l.* a-head, this will give the sum of 4,000,000*l.* An interest of 300,000*l.* upon this, amounts only to seven-and-a-half per cent., which, in that country, is a *low* interest. The fact is, however, that the Jesuits got a great deal more, when all their mercantile profits arising from the labours of the Indians are taken into account; but allowing the statement to stand simply thus, the following may be taken as a correct, and by no means exaggerated estimate of the wealth of the Jesuitical body in the towns of *Missiones*. There were thirty of these towns. Some of them were on the eastern, some on the western banks of the Paraná. Candilaria was the capital; but if we take the establishment of San Ignacio Miní, in the territory of Entrerios, as an average of them, both with regard to population and other property, by finding the value of that establishment, and by multiplying the result by 30, we shall come to as near a demonstration as figures can afford of the whole missions, at the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits. On this principle, the following calculation will be found very accurate:—

VALUE OF THE MISSIONARY ESTABLISHMENT OF SAN IGNACIO MINI.

| | | | | |
|---|-----|-------------|-------|-----------|
| 3500 Indians at . . . | £40 | 0s. a head. | . . . | £140,000 |
| 5000 head of horned cattle . . | 0 | 8 | ” . . | 2,000 |
| 1600 horses . . . | 0 | 4 | ” . . | 320 |
| 2000 mares . . . | 0 | 2 | ” . . | 200 |
| 700 mules . . . | 0 | 8 | ” . . | 280 |
| 500 asses . . . | 0 | 4 | ” . . | 100 |
| 5000 sheep . . . | 0 | 2 | ” . . | 500 |
| Buildings (church and residence) . . . | | | | 20,000 |
| Territory, 4 leagues square=16 leagues, at 40 <i>l.</i> . . . | | | | 640 |
| Church-ornaments and plate . . . | | | | 24,000 |
| So that the value of this Mission or Establishment was . . . | | | | £188,040 |
| Now multiply this by 30, and what will be the result ? Why, | | | | 5,641,200 |

“More than five million and a-half of our money ; which was truly the capital possessed by the Jesuits in Missions alone : to say nothing of the value of their sumptuous *Casas de temporalidades* and churches in every town of America. Now this was certainly too great a capital for any body of men to possess in that comparatively poor country, especially as the influence arising from it was increased by religious awe, political importance, and the means of physical resistance. Considering that the most wealthy merchants in Assumption were not in possession of more than seven or eight thousand pounds ; the shop-keepers not more than four or five thousand ; the landed proprietors not more than three or four ; seeing that all these, bent upon their own individual aggrandisement, were incapable of being appreciated, as a body, for any purpose of national resistance, especially at the expense of their own fortunes, and not only so, but that a large portion of them were absolutely in league with the Jesuits ; it must be confessed that the latter had a great deal more than their due share of influence in the country. Every year was adding new proselytes to their sect, and fresh

adherents to their party ; so that what by their wealth, their religious and political sway, and their growing interest with private individuals, the measure of the expulsion of the Jesuits, if at first it appear to have been harsh, will not perhaps be found, upon reflection, to have been either uncalled for, or premature.”¹

¹ Robertson, Letters on Paraguay, ii. 50, *et seq.* From a statistical table of the missionary towns of the Jesuits, drawn up at the time of their expulsion, it appears that the items of their temporalities in man and beast, were as follows :—21,036 families ; 88,864 souls ; 724,903 tame cattle (the wild being innumerable) ; 46,936 oxen ; 34,725 horses ; 64,353 mares ; 13,905 mules ; 7505 asses ; 230,384 sheep ; 592 goats—all in thirty towns, ranging over three degrees of latitude,—from 26° 53' S. to 29° 48' S. See the table, apud Robertson, *ubi supra* ii. Appendix.

BOOK IX. OR, CODURIUS.

THE matchless efforts, success, and reverses which we have hitherto contemplated throughout the heathen world of Jesuit-adventure, from the commencement of the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, have had their counterpart in the contemporaneous expansion of the Company in Europe. Men, such as we have seen at their work, went forth to the ends of the earth, crossing every sea ; and created power for the Company ; and they were adapted for their enterprise. But they left their equals behind,—men equally adapted for theirs,—which was not less comprehensive.

And how were these men qualified for their achievements ? What was the mental-training of which every Jesuit might take advantage, in order to qualify himself to perform his part in that drama, which the Company of Jesus was exhibiting to the wondering universe ? Let us accompany a Jesuit through his “ Education.”

An examination preceded the admission of every pupil to the benches of the Company. The Jesuits tested the quality of the metal before they undertook to coin their circulating medium. When the celebrated Clavius was admitted into a college of the Jesuits he

was passed through the ordeal—failed in all points, and was on *the* point of being dismissed as a hopeless block-head, when one of the Jesuits tried him in geometry. Nature responded : Clavius remained on the benches ; and became one of the first mathematicians of the age—having a share in the construction of the Gregorian Calendar, and sending forth his pupil, Matteo Ricci, to repeat his lessons to the Chinese, and build a Mission on lines, curves, and angles. This preliminary scrutiny, and sagacity in the discrimination of individual talent, not a little contributed to the exaltation of the Company.¹

The future Jesuit had to pass through five schools or grades of “inferior studies,”—as they were named ; but still, consisting of three gradations in grammar, the “Humanity,” and Rhetoric—one entire year for each of the five, unless evident competence justified an ascension or “skip” into a higher school or grade. The lowest class of grammar was confined to the rudiments of Latin and Greek. The pupil’s memory was practised by the lessons he repeated, and there was an appointed hour for a contest (*concertatio*) between the master and the pupils, or among the pupils themselves on the day’s lessons, when their judgment was exercised. On

¹ “How different from this manner of education is that which prevails in our own country !” says Addison ; “where nothing is more usual than to see forty or fifty boys of several ages, tempers, and inclinations, ranged together in the same class, employed upon the same authors, and enjoined the same tasks. Whatever their natural genius may be, they are all to be made poets, historians, and orators alike. They are all obliged to have the same capacity—to bring the same tale of verse, and to furnish the same portion of prose. Every boy is bound to have as good a memory as the captain of his form. To be brief, instead of adapting studies to the particular genius of a youth, we expect from him that he should adapt his genius to his studies. This, I must confess, is not so much to be imputed to the instructor, as to the parent, who will never be brought to believe, that his son is not capable of performing as much as his neighbour’s, and that he may not make him whatever he has a mind to.”—*Spectator*, No. 307.

Saturdays, all the lessons of the week were repeated, followed by a contest. The pupils had to translate from their vernacular into Latin, or from Latin into their vernacular—with constant examination as to the details of grammar—declensions, conjugations, and the simple rules of syntax.¹ The middle class of grammar occupied another year, with a wider range of reading in Cicero's Epistles, or Ovid, and an advance in Greek grammar, when the Company's Greek Catechism might be read:—of course, the same method as to memory, and the exercise of judgment was practised. In the highest class of grammar, the whole scheme of Latin, and the greater part of Greek grammar were compassed. Cicero's Epistles, *De Amicitia*, *De Senectute*, *Paradoxa*, and the like, with expurgated selections from Ovid's elegies and epistles, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Virgil's eclogues; in Greek, Chrysostom, Æsop, Agapetus, and the like. The same exercise of memory and judgment, as before, was now enhanced by a "*Prælectio*," which required the pupil to compose, on a given argument in Latin and his vernacular: he then gave the Latin of his vernacular composition; lastly, he was required to explain and elucidate the meaning of passages by one or two examples from the author he construed. He had to develop and explain his translation, and briefly notice its historical or scientific allusions. The metrical art was rigidly inculcated, and Cicero was the model of Latinity, in his beautiful epistles. It is evident that a thorough grounding in the languages is the main object of these three years. The humanity-class to which he ascended was the *soil of eloquence—veluti solum eloquentiæ*. The ethical treatises of Cicero, the historical works of Cæsar, Sallust, Livy, Curtius, and the

¹ Ratio Studiorum, Reg. Prof. Inf. Class. Gram.

like, with parts of Virgil, selections from Horace, and the elegiac and epigrammatic poems of the ancients, "purged from all obscenity," tended to expand his knowledge of the Latin, giving him facility and copious expression, which, in the last half year of the term, was further promoted by a selection from Cicero's orations. The usual contests, prælections, and weekly repetitions, were constantly practised. The theory of rhetoric was thoroughly learnt and applied. For his Greek, the pupil read Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and the like. "Rhetoric" proper then succeeded, "to mould the pupil unto perfect eloquence;"—it included poetry and oratory; its result must be proficiency in the theory of eloquence, style, and erudition. Cicero's rhetorical books, and Aristotle's Rhetorics and Poetics furnished the rules of useful art and ornament. Meanwhile, religious instruction went hand-in-hand with the courses throughout: the pupils heard mass every day, had instruction in Christian doctrine, and pious exhortations on stated days; the worship of the Virgin was a prominent object, with that of the Angel Guardian. The Lives of the Saints formed their spiritual reading; the pupils were bound to go to confession once a month.

Premiums for composition were awarded, and great display attended the proclamation of the successful competitors—whilst private and public declamations stimulated as effectually the Loyolan efforts to reach perfection. Nor was a prefect of the whip or public corrector, wanting. Those pupils who refused to submit to the rod, were forced—if it could be done with safety—*si tuto possint*; "big boys" were to be expelled the benches. *Pedagogues*, or advanced students appointed as teachers, prepared the students below them for the classes; there was a public Censor, "or if that name

did not please," a Decurio Maximus, or Prætor, appointed from among the boys, to keep them in order ; whilst a general Prefect ruled and managed the whole mass of juvenile intellect and morality, under the immediate control of the Rector, who was under the Provincial, over whom the General at Rome had authority.¹

Mathematics succeeded, with Euclid for its basis. After two months' grounding in the abstract, the pupil was led to the concrete, "somewhat of geography and the sphere" and the like, being united to Euclid. Every month, or every other month at least, in a great concourse of philosophers and theologians, some famous mathematical problem was solved by the pupil, and followed by an argumentation.

Thus prepared, the pupil entered upon Moral Philosophy. He was initiated in Aristotle's ethics, and the mysteries of metaphysics—all "well shaken" by frequent disputations among the students.²

Three years of Philosophy, properly so called, ensued :—interminable Logic agitated the first year, with its prædicaments, tropes, syllogisms, fallacies, and sophism ; Physics occupied the second, with all their curious experiments, as set forth by the inexhaustible Kircher, not excepting Generation according to the views of Aristotle : the Theory of the Soul, and the higher metaphysics, in a searching study of Aristotle, completed the third year of Philosophy. Monthly disputations, as usual, clenched the acquisition. Then might you hear the *Nego majorem*, the *Concedo minorem*, and the everlasting *Distinguo*.³

Such was the training given to every student of the

¹ Reg. Prof. Studior. infer.

² Reg. Prof. Mathem.

³ Reg. Prof. Schol. Theol. No. 20.

Jesuit-schools, during a period of *ten* years. At its completion, with the novitiate duly intervening at the time appointed, the professional course of the Jesuit commenced. Scholastic Theology unfolded unto him, “the solid subtlety of disputation together with the orthodox faith and piety.” *Four* long years were required to build up the ponderous edifice. Beginning with the Nature of Angels, through Faith, Hope, and Charity, Justice, Right, Religion, and the Incarnation,—the Sacraments in general, Scripture, Tradition, the Church, the Roman Pontiff, Restitution, and Usury and Contracts, the Jesuit-mind advanced to hard *Controversy* for the heretics, and soft *Casuistry* for the orthodox.¹

The method with the last was as follows:—the students prepared themselves for the consultation by “reading up” the “cases”—just like a medical student for his lecture. When they assembled, the teacher briefly delivered his opinion on a case: the students expressed their several views of the matter; and he “collected the safer and more probable doctrine.”² Thus, amidst the multitudinous expositions of the Jesuit casuists, the science was still, apparently, subject to fluctuations, according to individual organisations and the exigencies of the day.

Fourteen years might prepare the Jesuit for his enterprise: but the ordeal was not necessarily confined to that period of indoctrination:—it was still longer protracted if the student did not, in the given period, attain the requisite proficiency. None were permitted to advance to Philosophy without a competence in Rhetoric, nor to Theology without acquiring more than mediocrity in Philosophy.³

¹ *Ubi suprâ, passim.*

² Reg. Prof. Casuum Conscient., No. 9.

³ Reg. Provincial.

If any one, in the course of his studies, was found to be incompetent for Philosophy or Theology, he was transferred to the dissecting room of *Casuistry*, or made a teacher of the inferior studies.¹ Thus, it appears, that a casuist needed neither philosophy, nor theology to guide him in the concoction of those “safe” and “probable” opinions which guided the consciences of men.

To enter into further details on Jesuit education might be interesting; but sufficient has been said to “give an idea” of the important fact—namely, how the Jesuit was manufactured. Such a pains-taking method could not fail to send forth the wonderful workers whose achievements we have witnessed; and by the middle of the seventeenth century it had produced numberless authors to attest, at least, that indefatigable spirit of *industry* generated by Jesuit-education. And, if it have no other merit, to have inspired this *spirit of industry* was to fulfil one of the highest aims of education—and the very highest in a practical point of view; for it includes all the happy results of education, if disconnected from party-dogmatism, and professional warping.

By the middle of the seventeenth century, the Company had produced works in all the languages, ancient and modern—Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, &c., English, French, Dutch, German, Spanish, Hungarian, Illyrian, Italian, Portuguese, Polish, in the languages of India, and those of the savage-tribes of America, where the Jesuits actually created a vernacular—that which was common to all the Paraguay reductions. Upwards of seventy Jesuits had already treated on grammar in all

¹ “Si qui ergo in studiorum decursu inepti ad philosophiam, aut ad theologiam eo modo deprehensi fuerint, ad casuum studia, vel ad docendum Provincialis arbitrio destinetur.”—*Reg. Provincial.*, § 4.

languages, and of every tongue : more than twenty had illustrated philology and the art of criticism : as many had elucidated the art and theory of versification, to be subsequently farther promoted by the Jesuit Aler with his still enduring *Gradus ad Parnassum* ; and about a hundred and fifty poets scampered up the steps, if they never got admission to Parnassus. Andrew Denys with his “ Allurements of Love Divine ;” Frusius with his “ Epigrams against the Heretics ;” a tragedy on Nebuchadnezzar, by Brunner ; a poem on Ignatius of Loyola, by Antonio de Escobar ; the “ Convert Martin, a tragic-comedy,” by Sempervivus ; and “ Joseph the Chaste, a simple comedy,” by Cornelius Crocus ; Campion’s “ Nectar and Ambrosia, a tragedy,” and Southwell’s beautiful “ Peter’s Complaint,” with endless elegies, lyrics, epics, heroics, on Christ, the Virgin, the Saints, and every possible subject that can be imagined, from the “ Pious Desires ” of humanity to “ the Death of Henry IV. King of France,” and the “ Martyrs of the Company of Jesus,” laid the very extensive foundations of the Jesuit-Parnassus. Most of these poems were illustrated with exceedingly curious emblems, displaying the liveliest fancy and invention. Nothing can be more amusing than the emblems of the Dutch Jesuit, William Hesus, in his pious work entitled “ Sacred Emblems on Faith, Hope, and Charity.” An angel gazing at his shadow—“ seeing what he does not see ”—shows how “ faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,” Heb. xi. 1. A bird in a cage, supposed to be singing merrily in the ignorance of her captivity, typifies the words of Peter : “ Though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable,” 1 Pet. i. 8. An angel walking on the tight

rope embodies the words of Paul : “ And thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear,” Rom. xi. 20. To show how we lose faith by desiring ocular demonstration, we behold a curious angel opening a vessel and a bird escaping; to his evident affliction, saying, “ Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed,” John xx. 29. And to show how irresistible is faith, in Latin, *Fides*, this Dutchman exhibits a dapper little angel playing the *fiddle* before a door, with prominent hinges, to show that it is intended to open, as conveyed by the following cut and verses.



“ If faith remain, thou needst not die—
 Faith, life’s support and company :
 Strike up a tune,
 And very soon
 Belike they ’ll ope that door to thee.”¹

¹ “ Cur tamen hic moriere, fides si vivida restat !
 Illa comes vitæ, subsidiumque fides.
 Tende fidem, et digitis impelle fideliter istis ;
 Credibile hanc clausas pandere posse fores.”—

Hesi Emblem., lib. i. Emb. xxiv.

Hope is very strikingly typified by a *kettle on a blazing fire* ; “ whilst *Charity*, which is patient,” appears in the shape of the cobbler’s work, pierced and threaded on all sides, with this vigorous little angel and the verses below.



—*Patientia mater amantium est.*

Quid, ô deliciose, delicate,
Ictos ferre times, amoris ictus ?
Non his frangitur ille, sed ligatur ;
Neu dissolvitur, at redintegratur.
Jungunt vulnera cara dissidentes ;
Et unum poteris timere punctum ?¹


Think not, however, that the Jesuit-mind confined itself to these pleasing, though somewhat irreverent symbols. The Jesuit-spiritualists aimed at effect : by emblems, they captivated attention : hence the numberless pious books which they accompanied with illustrations. Whilst Hesus tickled the fancy, the awful Drexelius struck terror into the stoutest heart by his pictures of “ Hell, the Prison, and Fire of the Damned.”² No adequate idea can be given of this horrible and

¹ Hesi Emblem., lib. iii. emb. vii.

² Infernus Damnatorum Career et Rogus, ab Hier. Drexelio, Soc. Jesu, 1632.

presumptuous concoction. “Two-fold,” says he, “is the darkness of hell. I call the one the body’s darkness, and exterior, the other is that of the soul and interior. Those of the body far exceed the horrible, thickest, palpable darkness of Egypt. Fire in hell can burn, but it cannot give light. What Wisdom said of the Egyptian darkness, must be said of infernal darkness : they shall be bound altogether with one chain of darkness,—

*“Clausi tenebris et carcere cæco.”*¹



“Your love-songs and lascivious warblings—your

¹ *Ubi supra*, p. 13.


choral dances shall be expiated : instead of them an eternal Wo ! Wo ! Wo ! shall resound. The damned will curse God, the saints, themselves, and all the companions of their sins—the son will execrate his parent, the parent his son, the daughter her mother, the mother the daughter—all will whelm with malediction the days and years of their life, and the day of their birth.”¹



He assumes the number of the damned to be about one hundred thousand millions, all confined in a flaming prison, only one German mile in length, breadth, and height, and gives the following scene to illustrate the

¹ *Ubi suprâ*, p. 41.

seventh torment of hell—that of “the *place* and *company*, above measure wretched and very detestable.”¹



One more sample from this Jesuit-demonologist: it is “The inexplicable or ninth torment of the damned.” After stating the ten plagues of Egypt, Drexelius proceeds: “Though God afflicts his enemies in hell with nine most grievous torments, he never adds a *tenth* whereby to end their existence. No end—no death—no destruction! Yea, as Gregory saith, death without death, and end without end, because that death still lives, and that end is always beginning,—an eclipse whose darkness cannot diminish. What was the greatest torment of the Egyptians, would be the greatest comfort

¹ *Ubi suprà*, p. 127 and 129.

to the damned—namely, to have their throats cut—*jugulari*, and be utterly ‘done for’ at last—*funditus tolli*.”¹ And here’s the Jesuit’s notion of the “inexplicable ninth torment of the damned.”



Is it possible to conceive anything more ridiculous in its horror?—Yes; and the Jesuit-philosopher Kircher supplies it. In his work on the *Magnetic Art*, he argues that the spherical is the only form that “fire, water, sand, and other liquid bodies,” can assume at the centre of the earth. Hereupon he builds a *conjecture*. “If it be true,” says Kircher, “as it is most true, which is handed down by the almost unanimous consent of all

¹ *Ubi suprâ*, p. 183.

the holy fathers, namely, that hell has been placed in the lowest part of the earth by God—so that those who have removed themselves furthest from God by the gravity of their sins, should deservedly hold the last and remotest place in nature, which place can be no other than that vast whirlpool of the fiery crater round the earth's centre : now, certainly, it clearly follows from the preceding demonstrations, that after the universal resurrection of the flesh, all the bodies of the damned are to be *heaped into a ball*, because *no superficies but the circular can there be conceived*. Thus they will endure their punishment, as long as God shall be God, for endless eternities—rolled up and jammed even as *herrings in a tub*—*quemadmodum haleces in doliis*.¹

“Hence,” says the Jesuit, “the Christian soul may learn to depart from sin,”—lest they be jammed for ever even as herrings in a tub! Such were the pious notions inculcated by these interesting Jesuits of old, and even now admired—for there is a “*Protestant*” translation of a part of Drexelius’s *Infernus*.

As may be supposed, the Art Rhetoric was copiously cultivated by the Jesuits : upwards of twenty disputed the palm with Cicero, or, at all events, borrowed his glorious title of *De Oratore*, either collectively or in

¹ Si verum est, uti est verissimum, quod unanimi ferè omnium sanctorum patrum consensu traditur, infernum in infimo terræ loco à Deo constitutum, ut qui peccatorum gravitate à Deo se quam longissimè removerunt, ultimum meritò, et remotissimum in sensibili naturâ locum occupent, qui cùm alius esse non possit, quàm ingens illa ignei crateris circa centrum universi constituta vorago ; certè ex præmissis luculenter patet, post universalem carnis resurrectionem, damnatorum corpora omnia in unum globum coacervanda, cùm nulla ibi superficies nisi circularis concipi possit. Quemadmodum itaque haleces in doliis, ita ea conglobata pœnas peccatis suis condignas, quam diu Deus erit Deus, id est, omnis finis expertes tanto acerbiores, quanto centro terræ fuerint propinquiore, in perpetuas æternitates sustinebunt. Discat hic Christiana mens à peccatis recedere, &c.—*De Arte Magn.*, lib. iii. ; *Physiol. Kircheriana*, p. 4, and Drexel., ut antea, p. 130.

detail, discursively evolving all the principles of Tully's art in all its branches ; and as many more Loyolans gave to the enlightened world models of the art, in the shape of orations, panegyrics on the saints, the kings, and nobles, who befriended the Company, and funeral laudations in immense numbers, which points at once to the credit of the "fashionable preachers."¹

Not less fruitful were the Jesuit-schools in mathematicians. At the head of a septuagint of Euclids, the first place must be given to Christopher Clavius, the master of Matteo Ricci. Gregory XIII. chose Clavius to superintend the reformation of the calendar, in which capacity he had to endure and reply to the attacks of Joseph Scaliger, Vieta, and others of less renown. As a mathematical writer, Clavius is distinguished by the number of his works, the frequency with which they were reprinted, his rigid adherence to the geometry of the ancients, and the general soundness of his views. The most learned Germans resorted to Rome to converse with Clavius, and he deserved the esteem in which he was held by the Company ; for no member served her more indefatigably than Clavius. His works extend through five volumes, and consist of commentaries on Euclid, a treatise on Arithmetic, Gnomonics, the Astrolabe, Algebra, Practical Geometry, and "Defences" against those who attacked him, in the matter of the Calendar, of which he gives an account. As Clavius did not possess any great original talent, his works are now of little consequence, except to the mathematical historian. All the other mathematicians of the Company wrote chiefly on the practical applications of the science to Astronomy,

¹ See, in the Bibl. Scrip. Soc. Jesu, a list of these orators, extending through eight columns folio, pp. 530, *et seq.*

Optics, the construction of clocks, Music ; and Paul Guldin sent forth a “Dissertation on the Earth’s Motion, tending to change its Centre of Gravity ;”¹ and Wolfgang Schonsleder enlightened the Company on the art of Musical Composition.²

The Company could boast of few metaphysicians, but in logic, physics, philosophy in general, ethics, and politics, she had numbered more than a hundred writers. Some of their subjects were very curious. “On the Magnetic Ointment and its Use ;”³ on “Hydrology, or the Art of Navigation ;”⁴ “Flora, or the Cultivation of Flowers ;” “On the Cure of Wounds by Magnetism, and the Armarian Ointment ;”⁵ and “On the Birth of Infants by the Cæsarean Operation.”⁶ But one of the most curious specimens of the Jesuit-mind is Nieremberg’s “*Curiosa Filosofia*, or Curious Philosophy and Treasury of Wonders.” Its title admirably beseems the work. In the four hundred pages of a small duodecimo, he has heaped together an immense number of entertaining “facts,” with a copiousness of illustration never tedious. He enlarges on Sympathy and Antipathy, and does not think it impossible that music has an effect on certain plants, and he deduces the hypothesis most ingeniously. There are plants which are “sensitive,” or contract at the touch. Now philosophers explain musical sounds as the joint effect of aerial vibrations. Therefore, when the air is set in motion by the sound, it *touches* the said plants, which consequently *hear* music ! And what is his object in the book ?—To

¹ Paul. Goldin, Dissertatio de Motu Terræ ad Mutationem Centri ipsius.

² De Modo Musicæ componendo Architectonice Musices universalis.

³ Gaspar. Wenekh, Notæ Unguenti Magnetici et Uctionis ejusdem.

⁴ Georg. Fournier, Hydrologia, seu de Arte Navigandi, lib. xxiv.

⁵ Joan. Roberti Tract. IV. De Magneticâ Vulnerum Curatione, et Unguento Armario.

⁶ Raynaud. De Ortu infantum per Sectionem Cæsariam.

show that “the Sacraments are typified in Nature !” All the mysteries of the Faith in like manner he finds figured in Nature—the Incarnation, Redemption, the Passion of Christ, the Resurrection, the Vocation of the Gentiles.¹ In fact, Nieremberg completely levels Faith to the meanest capacity, and leaves no room for doubt in the man who has eyes to see, and ears to hear—for everything in nature proves something in “religion.” Somewhat in the same track went Daniel Bartoli with his book entitled “Geography transported to Morality.” It is a combination of geographical emblems without plates. The “Fortunate Isles” represent, in a long dissertation, “court-favour.” The “Frozen Ocean” is “wise fear, or stupid timidity ;” the “Dead Sea” is “nobility of blood lost by the corruption of morals ;” and the “Holy Land” suggests an exhortation to the reader to make his own house worthy of that name.² Strange vagaries! and, however amusing, well adapted to render the object in view as ridiculous as the illustrations employed.

The fields of the Company’s operations employed many pens, as well as souls and bodies. More than a hundred and fifty Jesuits had published to the world the exploits of the Company in the *Terra Incognita* of the Missions, together with curious information on the “incidents of travel,” and edifying sentiments and inventions for the devout. Whithersoever the Jesuits went, they were discoverers. In China they collected materials for the history of that empire ; in India their investigations in all the branches of science and history, were more or less valuable contributions to knowledge ; in America they found time, amidst their gigantic labours, to interest

¹ *Curiosa Filosofia*, c. 24, f. 23, *et seq.*, and c. 66, *et seq.*

² *Della Geografia transportata al Morale.*

and amuse the curious, as well as edify the devotees of Europe. Paez, who figured in Abyssinia, discovered the source of the Nile.

In history, the Company shone by the light of her wayward son Mariana, the historian of Spain; and hundreds of minor lamps shed feeble rays on the obscurities of the past. Orlandinus and Sacchinus wrote the history of the Company.¹ The Belgic

¹ "Self-conceit and leisure," says Ranke, "gradually induced most of the Orders to narrate their own histories in detail. But none of them did this so systematically as the Jesuits. Their aim was to give to the world, under their own hands, a connected and comprehensive history of all their Order had achieved. In fact, the *Historia Societatis Jesu*, known to us under the names of Orlandinus and his continuators, is a work of the highest importance for the history of the Order—nay, we may say, for that of the century in general." His latinity and style are in imitation of Livy, and occasionally bombast, with involved and periphrastic obscurities. "His successor in this task," continues Ranke, "was Sacchinus, clearly the most distinguished of the historians of the Jesuits. He was the son of a peasant: his father sometimes visited him in the Roman College, where he taught rhetoric; and it is to his honour stated, that he was not ashamed of his birth. After this, he devoted himself for eighteen years to the composition of his history, in the probationary-house upon the Monte Quirinale, which he hardly ever quitted. But he nevertheless passed his life in the contemplation of the great events of the world. The restoration of Catholicism was still in the most vigorous progress. Sacchinus felt distinctly the one grand peculiarity of his subject—the universal battle fought in the enthusiasm of orthodoxy," but which was combined with so many more grovelling sentiments in the vast majority of its champions. "I narrate wars," says Sacchinus, "not those of nations with each other, but of the human race with the monsters and powers of hell: wars that embrace not single provinces, but all lands and seas; wars, in fine, wherein not earthly power, but the heavenly kingdom, is the prize of victory." In this tone of Jesuitical exultation he has described the generalship of Lainez, 1556—1564; of Borgia, up to 1572, and Mercurianus, up to 1580; each in one volume containing eight books, and the first ten years of Aquaviva's rule, in the same number of books. His work makes four rather thick and closely-printed folio volumes: nevertheless he apologises for being so brief. Juvenci, in 1710, published a continuation of Sacchinus, comprising the last fifteen years of Aquaviva. Juvenci's work was a failure: it was condemned in France, and "the Order even entertained the intention, at one time, of having that whole period re-written upon the model of Sacchinus." Cordara continued the History, from 1616 to 1625, adhering to the model of Sacchinus: "but the spirit of the earlier times was irrevocably lost. Cordara's volume is very useful, but not to be compared in freedom or

Province put forth the famous *Imago Primi Sæculi Societatis Jesu*,—the Image of the First Century of the Company,—in the year 1640. It was prepared to celebrate the *hundredth year* of the Company's duration. Several Jesuits contributed to the gigantic production. Tollenarius was the director, assisted by Henschenius, Bollando, Hoschius, and De Poirtres,—the two last named being the poets of the Image.

No enemy of the Jesuits could have put forth a more damaging burlesque of the Company. I have given numerous specimens from the engravings which teem throughout the work ; but these specimens are far from being the most ridiculous and fantastic in that monument of mental extravagance. Historically, it attests that bewilderment which, at the period in question, was driving the Company to destruction.

Imagine a huge folio of 952 pages, every one of which is devoted to a fantastic emblem or the most extravagant self-laudation. "The Company," says this Image, "is Israel's chariot of fire, whose loss Elisha mourned,—and which now, by a special grace of God, both worlds rejoice to see brought back from heaven to earth, in the desperate condition of the Church. In this chariot, if you seek the armies and soldiers by which she daily multiplies her triumphs with new victories, you

power with its older predecessors, or even with Juvenci. It appeared in 1750. Since then, the Company had to struggle too hard for very existence to think of any continuation of its history. Moreover, had any such been produced, it would have displayed a greatly diminished splendour." Besides these, there are numerous histories of the various provinces, such as Germany, England, Italy, Portugal, &c. Bartoli's enormous six folios exhaust the subject in India, China, and Japan, and he is, perhaps, the only Jesuit-annalist worth reading for style. Gioberti, the present foe of the Jesuits, gives Bartoli more praise than Tiraboschi awards to his brother-Jesuit.

will find (and I hope you will take it in good part), you will find a chosen troop of angels, who exhibit under the forms of animals, all that the Supreme Ruler desires in this chivalry.”¹

“As the angels, enlightened by the splendours of God, purge our minds of ignorance, suffuse them with light, and give them perfection—thus the Companions of Jesus, copying the purity of angels, and all attached to their origin, which is God, from whom they derive those fiery and flaming movements of virtue, with rays the most refulgent, putting off the impurities of lust in that furnace of supreme and chastest love, in which they are consumed (*excoquantur*, *cooked*),—until, being illuminated and made perfect, they can impart to others their light mingled with ardour—being not less illustrious for the splendour of their virtue than the fervour of charity with which they are divinely inflamed.”²

“They are angels like Michael, in their most eloquent battles with the heretics,—like Gabriel in the conversion of the infidels in India, Ethiopia, Japan, and the Chinese hedged in by terrible ramparts,—they are like Raphael, in the consolation of souls, and the conversion of sinners

¹ Imago, lib. iii. p. 401. “Hic est currus ille igneus Israël, quem Eliseus olim plorabat ereptum; nunc uterque orbis, singulari Dei beneficio, afflictis Ecclesiæ rebus, gaudet è cælis adductum: in quo si acies queras et milites, quibus triumphos suos quotidianâ accessione multiplicat, invenies (absit verbo invidia) delectum Angelorum, qui sub animalium formis produnt quod ab iis Supremus Imperator in hac militiâ requirat.”

² Imago, lib. iii. p. 401. “Itaque, quemadmodum beatæ illæ mentes, magnæ illius Mentis purissimæ quædam velut scintillæ, et sempiterni luminis facibus accensæ . . . animos nostros à rerum aliquarum ignorance purgandi vim habent, eosque illuminandi et cumulatissimè perficiendi: ita Socii Jesu, angelicæ puritatis æmuli, totique origini suæ, id est Deo, affixi, à quo igneos et celeres virtutis motus, splendidissimosque radios hauriunt, absumptâ voluptatum colluvione, in fornace illâ supremi et castissimi amoris excoquantur, donec probè illuminati et perfecti, lucem, ardore mixtam, aliis communicent,—non minus illustres splendore virtutis, quam divinitus inflammati fervore caritatis.”

by sermons, and the confessional. *All* rush with promptitude and ardour to hear confessions, to catechise the poor, and children, as well as to govern the consciences of the great and princes :—*all* are not less illustrious for their doctrine and wisdom—so that we may say of the Company what Seneca observes in his 33rd Epistle, namely, that there is an inequality in which eminent things become remarkable : but that we do not admire a tree when all the others of the same forest are equally high. Truly, in whatever direction you cast your eyes, you will discover some object that would be supereminent, if the same were not surrounded by equals in eminence.”¹

In other words, each Jesuit was neither a triton among the dolphins, nor a whale among the sprats.

In a similar strain we are told that the Company’s advent was “predicted by the prophet Isaiah,” when he said “*Ite, Angeli veloces*—Go forth, ye swift messengers,”² and verily it may be so, for the whole passage applies most strikingly to the Jesuits and the popedom—“Woe to the land shadowing with wings, which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia : that sendeth ambassadors by the sea, even in vessels of bulrushes upon the waters, saying, Go, ye swift messengers, to a nation scattered and *peeled*, to a people, terrible from their beginning hitherto, —a nation meted out and trodden down, whose land

¹ Imago, lib. iii. p. 402. “Invenies in hac Societate, qui pro Dei sui gloriâ, et Ecclesiæ defensione cum hæreticis et schismaticis ore et calamo disertissimè decertent : Michaëlem hi referunt. Alios qui ad Indos terribilibus circumvallatos custodiis Sinenses Gabrielem illi adumbrant. Alios qui pauperum satagunt Raphaëlis isti vestigia sectantur Ut quod Romanus sapiens suo more prudenter expendit, hic locum habeat : *Inæqualitatem scias esse ubi quæ eminent notabilia sunt : non est admirationi una arbor, ubi in eandem altitudinem tota silva surrexit.* Sanè, quocunque miseris oculus, id tibi occurrit, quod eminere posset, nisi inter paria legeretur.”

² Ibid, p. 60.

the rivers have spoiled!" And verily again, there is a terrible reminding in the words that follow : " For, afore the harvest, when the bud is perfect, and the sour grape is ripening in the flower, He shall both cut off the sprigs with pruning-hooks, and take away and cut down the branches. They shall be left together unto the fowls of the mountains, and to the beasts of the earth ; and the fowls shall summer upon them, and all the beasts of the earth shall winter upon them."¹

Could these bewildered Jesuits have possibly chosen a more unfortunate text to prophesy their coming ?

Need I enlarge in quotations from this stupendous *olla podrida* of the Jesuits ? They are all lions, eagles, heroes, chosen men, thunderbolts of war ; they are born with helm on head ; each man is equal to a host.² The Company is a great miracle, like the world ; and therefore she need not perform other miracles.³

Ignatius is greater than Pompey, Cæsar, or Alexander,—yea, greater than all the conquerors of the world.⁴

The Company is not only compared to "the Church," but to Jesus Christ himself ;—in fact, the whole book is an effort to show how the Jesuits thought they had equalled the God whose name they disgraced, and condemned to everlasting obloquy in the word Jesuit :—in this word they certainly carried the name of Jesus to the uttermost bounds of the earth, and have left it everywhere in no enviable odour.⁵

¹ Isaiah, xviii. 1, 2, 5, 6. The last verse in the chapter may certainly be applied to Protestantism, in order to complete the allegory : " In that time shall the present be brought unto the Lord of hosts, of a people scattered and peeled," &c. &c.—*Isaiah*, xviii. 7.

² *Imago*, pp. 402, 410.

³ *Ib.* p. 621.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 280.

⁵ In Arnould's *Morale Pratique des Jesuites* (t. i. 64—170), there is an

The IMAGO is pompously dedicated to God Almighty. The Jesuit-editions of the “Fathers” and other

excellent analysis of the Imago, with very apposite remarks and reflections. The frontispiece to the work is perhaps the most astounding part of the whole performance—as it were the miniature of the whole Image. The Company is represented as a young girl, with three angels above her head crowning her with three diadems—one of virginity, the other of learning, the third of martyrdom. On her right she has an angel sounding a trumpet, with the words *Ignatius has numbered a hundred years*; and on the left, another angel sounding with the words *Let him fill the whole world*. The female figure has the name of Jesus on her breast, and says: *Non nobis Domine, non nobis*. She has a pen in her right hand, and with her left she holds a cross in flames. On the right, at her feet, is the emblem of Time; and on the left, also at her feet, are a mitre and a cardinal’s hat. Along the borders of the picture there are six emblems, corresponding to the six books of the Imago—five representing the Company in general, and the sixth the Belgic Province, which produced the work. The first emblem is a name of Jesus which is made to represent a sun, and a new moon, with this inscription, *The Company born of Jesus—Societas à Jesu nata*: below, another states that *She receives all things from the Sun—Omnia solis habet*. The second emblem is a globe of light, with this inscription above, *The Company spread all over the world*; and below, *She shines through the universe*. The third emblem is a moon at midnight, with this device, *The Company does good to all the world*; and below, *She preserves all things in the middle of the night*. The fourth is the moon eclipsed by the interposing earth ’twixt herself and the sun, and the upper motto is, *The Company suffering evils from the world*; the lower is, *The Company eclipsed by the opposition of the earth*. The fifth,—a sun, a moon, and the shadow of the earth, with these words above, *The Company becomes more illustrious by persecutions*; and below, *The shadow only serves to make her more beautiful*. The sixth is the province of Belgium;—it is a Lion in the zodiac *Et hanc Leo Belgicus ambit*. At the foot of one of the columns is a palm-tree, to show that the Company will flourish for ever: on the other side, is a Phenix, to show that she will flourish like a Phenix. There are two little angels at the feet of the image; one holds a mirror with these words, *Without spot*; the other has the words *sine cere*, *Without brass*! But the emblems signify the Company’s chastity and poverty.

Exactly in the same vein were Tanner’s two works, entitled *Societas Jesu usque ad Sanguinis et Vitæ profusionem militans*, giving all her martyrs; and the *Societas Jesu Apostolorum Imitatrix*, which is lavish with her professional operations throughout the universe. Tanner has the full measure of Jesuit-vanity and impudence. In the latter work he represents Ignatius in a cloud on high, whence, like another Messiah, he scatters over the universe his mighty mind in the form of tongues of fire. All the other images are equally extravagant and impious. I need not state that all these works were published with the Company’s sanction in every particular; the *Imago*, in 1640, Tanner’s works in 1675 and 1694.

ancient luminaries, have long enjoyed a merited reputation. About sixty Jesuits were engaged in this obstetric department of the enterprising Company. Fronto Ducaeus edited, amongst others, the voluminous writings of Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil and Clement of Alexandria; whilst Andrew Schottus mounted not less than twenty of these great guns of the Church for the arsenal of faith. Jacob Gretser, styled by the Jesuits “the conqueror and sledge-hammer of the heretics,” won immense consideration in this department. Such was the industry of this Jesuit, in the midst of numerous bodily ailments, that within the space of twenty years he wrote and published more than a hundred works, almost all of them against the heretics,—besides editing about a score of the antiques. Nieremberg, with whom the reader is acquainted, published extracts from all the ancient Fathers, sacred doctors, and learned writers of the Church.¹ This must be a very useful work to the writers of spiritual books, and sermons. It does great credit to the industrious Jesuit; for the book is not a mere tissue of isolated extracts, but all the extracts are selected in such a manner that they form continuous homilies or discourses, each of which is the joint-production of at least a dozen antiques. Without admitting that it requires as much genius well to apply a quotation, as to compose the sentiment, still, the manner in which Nieremberg has performed his task, is quite equal to the composition of the most original production. Admirable order, tact, and discrimination everywhere preside over the selection of his materials. The work is a model of its kind. It would be a great

¹ “Homiliæ Catenatæ, sive Collectaneæ ex vetustis Patribus, sacris doctoribus, et eruditis scriptoribus.” Ant. 1651.

acquisition to our literature, if the same method were applied to reproduce the thoughts and sentiments of our Elizabethan worthies, in continuous dissertations all contributing to uphold some striking argument.

There is another work of this extraordinary genius which really deserves notice. It is entitled, *Questions of Curious Reading*.¹ Nieremberg's object is to start questions on various passages of the ancients unexplained, and to offer his answers or conjectures in explanation. It is divided into twenty-two decades, thus proposing 220 "questions of his curious reading;" which he prefaces with some very solid and useful hints to all readers. "As study, without results, is next door to ignorance, so is useless reading not far from idleness. But what reading is more useless than that which we do not understand? He who understands as he goes along, reads without trouble. The hunting of truths is a literary pursuit. We hunt ideas whilst we read: these must be pursued and caught. Such is the use of reading. But, as in other things, we are intemperate in our reading: few apply literature to the benefit of the mind; we pour ourselves out on unprofitable trifles."² The object of some readers is not to become acquainted with books, but to go through them voraciously, to turn over new ones, to understand none—just like misers who covet gold which they use not.

¹ *Erotemata Curiosæ Lectionis*, appended to the work just noticed.

² Without for one moment questioning the ability of the author, still the most popular humourist of the present day is a striking illustration of the spirit of the age. So vast is the circulation of his laughter-making productions, that his last work could not have cost the public less than £30,000! Unquestionably laughter promotes digestion, but to pay so large a sum for the function of tickling, does seem, in a philosophical point of view, very absurd. What a mass of solid, digestible, suggestive, thought-producing information might have been laid on the tables of the people, with less than a fortieth part of that mighty

We should use, and not abuse erudition by excess. We should not scamper over words, but investigate their meaning, discussing what is doubtful." Such is the greater part of Nieremberg's preface to his very curious and suggestive production. A sample or two may be interesting.

"Why did Orpheus call Jupiter *χρονοκάρδιον*, that is, *the heart of time*? Is it because time is dead when it is passed without God? The memory of God is the fortune of life, and vital is the day which religion occupies."¹

sum! But then there is no *taste* for the proposed substitute, is the reply. And how comes the deficiency? From defective *early education*. Accustomed from our youth upwards to *kill time*—we have only to bury our intellect by piece-meal, throughout that period of this mortal pilgrimage (so delightful if we chose to make it so) in which we should reap the fruits of early sowing, and treasure up the crop for the time when words of wisdom shall honour the venerable locks of age. It is a fallacy to say that "light reading" is a necessary recreation—any more than tipping or dram-drinking is a necessary aid to the stomach. D'Aguesseau said that "a change of study was always a recreation for him"—and every hearty student can attest the fact,—which results from the healthy vigour and *desire* for exercise in each faculty of every well-constituted, well-trained intellect. Now, it should be the object of education to arouse and stimulate the taste or desire most salient in the intellect of each individual. Thus trained he will have "something to do" throughout existence, and he will abhor to "kill time" almost as much as to commit any other murder. His education will never end; each day and hour he will be learning something new to him; and all so pleasantly that we may affirm that the intellectual activity which results from a sound mental constitution, duly trained by the early habit of labour, is a promoter of happiness and health, by God appointed. To such a man nothing without or within, is useless or without its application. His mind clings in delight to every object in creation, whose beautiful economy is suggested through endless ramifications even by the sight of a flower or a leaf—ay, by the very grains of sand which grit beneath his feet. And the joyous consciousness of health—freedom from pain—keen relish for all God's blessings in nature—the constant conviction of a benign providence over all, whose every design, every effort, is to promote the happiness of every creature—in such a state of the mind we have no time to "pour ourselves out on unprofitable literary trifles."

¹ "Cur Jovem vocavit Orpheus *χρονοκάρδιον*, id est, *cor temporum*? An quia

“Why did Orpheus call Hercules ἀλλόμορφον, that is, *of various forms*? Is it because the patient and persevering man appears in a two-fold aspect—the one being a certain outward mask of afflictions, and the other the inward face of true felicity? Perhaps he spoke of him in the same sense, saying,

‘Ὅς περὶ κρατὶ φορεῖς ἡῶ, καὶ νύκτα μέλαιναν.

For indeed the persevering man bears alike the darkness of night, and the brightness of day. To him reason ever shines; amidst the darkness of calamity his splendid mind is illumined; amidst the miseries of life he knows how to be happy.”¹

Thus always interesting, Nieremberg performs his promise in his preface, to put forth certain problems which may, perhaps, be useful to some—*quæ aliquorum fortasse usui servant.*

He was born of German parents, in Madrid, where he seems to have passed his life. In the Jesuit college at Madrid he professed Natural History, and subsequently the Holy Scriptures. His works are very numerous—among the rest the “*Varones Illustres*,” or “*Illustrious Men of the Company of Jesus*,” in six double-columned folios, and in choice Castilian, which always compensates for the absurdities which he relates *professionally*

tempus est mortuum, quod sine Deo transigitur? Memoria Dei usum vitæ fortunat, et vitalis est dies quem Religio occupat.”—*Dec. xvi. No. 4.*

¹ “Cur Orpheus vocat Herculem ἀλλόμορφον, hoc est *variformem*? An quia patentis et constantis viri duplex sit species, exterior quædam larva ærumnarum, et interior veræ felicitatis facies? Fortasse eodem sensu de illo inquit—

‘Ὅς περὶ κρατὶ φορεῖς ἡῶ, καὶ νύκτα μέλαιναν.

Fert quidem constans sibi vir diem serenum et noctem nigram. Illucet illi semper ratio, cujus inter calamitatum tenebras fulget splendidus animus, et inter misérias hujus vitæ scit beari.”—*Dec. xv. No. 8.*

—like many others, without half the recommendations of Juan Eusebio Nieremberg—a thorough German.

Amongst the editors of the Fathers, was Theophilus Raynaldus, a very remarkable Jesuit. He passed sixty years in the Company, although constantly harassed and crossed by his brethren, and in spite of the solicitations with which he was urged to leave the Society. A wild, expatiating genius, who thought for himself on many points—with a penetrating intellect, brilliant imagination, and a prodigious memory—one of the few which find it difficult to cast away, not to retain, what it has once received.

Apparently the mildest of men in domestic intercourse, pen in hand he was a very savage to the objects of his vituperation. Nothing can exceed his biting sarcasm under the name of *Pretus à Valle Clausá*, a satire against the monks of St. Dominic. The parliaments of Aix and Toulouse condemned the book to be publicly burnt—the curious method then in vogue for burking an author—like the wholesale denunciation of our modern critics when they have “good reasons” for the process. Raynaldus subjected himself to reproof in the Company, for certain slighting remarks on Ignatius—nay, “injurious and opprobrious to our holy father,” as the general wrote to the whole Company; but, luckily, Theophilus was dead at the time when the treatise appeared in the collected edition of his works.¹

As a sample of the comical turn of his mind, or the extraordinary perceptions of the Jesuit, and the originality of his discursive genius, in one of his treatises he

¹ See Bartoli, Dell' Ital. lib. iii. p. 348. The title of the tract is: “De exsolutione à votis Religionis substantialibus,” in the 18th volume of the works of Raynaldus. Bartoli is very savage with Raynaldus for charging him with having

heads a chapter on the "Goodness of Christ" as follows:—*Christus—bonus, bona, bonum*—which he evolves with all the fecundity of a Nieremberg. In his *Heteroclita Spiritualia*, he denounces fantastic and exotic devotion, as repugnant to solid piety and *good taste*.

Many of his works were put on the Roman *Index*,—that is, prohibited at Rome, on account of their free opinions. There was, therefore, no wonder that the author should write a work, entitled, "Questions concerning Good and Bad Books,"—*Erotemata de bonis et malis Libris*.

All his works were published collectively in 1665, two years after he died, aged eighty years. They filled twenty volumes in folio; but the sale was unsatisfactory, and the publisher, Boissat, was ruined, and died at the hospital.¹

In the biographical and hagiographical department of literature, the Jesuits were most prolific. About 240 writers on these subjects were produced by the

transformed Ignatius from a father into an executioner. Raynaldus was another Mariana in the Company—only he wisely contented himself with expressing his opinions on abuses.

¹ Feller, xvii. 139. As the "spirit" of a publisher is the result of a certain success following his tact and discernment, in catering for the public taste, these voluminous and thoughtful publications of former times, stand in the most striking contrast with our modern literary issues. The ponderous *folio* dwindled to the *quarto*, where it lingered awhile, and then the triple octavo became sacred to fiction, whilst to the Muse of History the now stately *Demy Octavo* is the *ne plus ultra* of typographical adventure. If the innumerable publications of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and early part of the eighteenth century, may be taken as a test that they "*paid*," and considering that all these publications were of an intellectual cast, how the contrast with the present age of publication is deepened! Unquestionably it was the Reformation which gave the impulse to education; but the gigantic educational scheme of the Jesuits promoted the intellect of the age, and created numerous tastes which their numerous authors gratified with wonderful fecundity. At the present day the public generally lead the author and certainly the publisher; but perhaps, with some tact and management, a spirited publisher, with commensurate literary aid, might lead that public taste, which is

Company ere she numbered her hundredth year. It was in the early part of the seventeenth century that the famous *Bollandist* speculation was conceived. The Jesuit Rosweyde was the first to imagine the enterprise ; he began the task, but left it to John Bollandi, who, in 1643, published, at Anvers, the first two volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*, or Lives of the Saints. It was a gigantic undertaking, and a generation of hagiographers were needed to ensure success. Two other Jesuits joined Bollandi, — Henschen and Papebroek. These erudites are the famous *Bollandists* to whom the leader's name was justly given. They died ; but their spirit lived in the successors which the Company incessantly gave to every enterprise :—she flung her men, just like Napoleon, into the thickest of the fight. Fourteen other Jesuits continued the work—chiefly *Germans*, as may be supposed. Such was the success of the work that, at the suppression of the Company, the capital realised by the publication amounted to 136,000 florins, about 13,600*l.*,—yielding an interest of about 900*l.* per annum, subject to an annual augmentation of 240*l.* by the yearly continuation of the work. In its present state it consists of forty-four enormously thick folios, with numerous plates—not, however, in the best style of the art. Of course all this capital and property were confiscated at the suppression of the Company.¹

now imperious. And if educators would promote a healthier development of mentality in their pupils, it would only require a single generation to display the most cheering results to humanity. The public taste which has been systematically vitiated since the days of Walter Scott (admirable as he was) might be restored universally to that healthy state, which is the object, or certainly the effect, in giving solid food to the minds and hearts of the people.

¹ Mem. sur les Bollandistes et leurs Travaux, by Gachard, archivist of Belgium, 1835 ; Cretineau, iv. 307.

Always insisting on the worship of the Virgin, more than a hundred Jesuits celebrated Mary in prose and verse, in every possible view of the Roman image,—whilst the Life of Christ and the incidents of the Passion did not occupy more than a fourth of that number. Mystic theology, collections of prayers, and meditations, ascetic or spiritual books, went forth in immense profusion—many of them illustrated, like those of Drexelius. From three to four hundred Jesuits were employed in feeding the minds of their devotees—"Goads to Sinners," "the Worm of a Bad Conscience," "the Fount of Spiritual Delights," and hundreds of similar "catching" titles, everywhere recommended the fashionable confessors of the Company. In polemics or controversy, the Jesuits were of course immensely prolific:—the number of their productions in this department equalled that of their devotional lucubrations, which they backed with numberless catechisms for the young in various languages.

Nearly a hundred casuists were engaged on the consciences of men, and an equal number on scholastic theology, whilst double the number sent forth voluminous commentaries on the Old and New Testament, every book, chapter and verse of which, from Genesis to the Revelation, were learnedly expounded by the Jesuits.¹

Such was Jesuit education, and such were its results, in the circumstances of the epoch. Numerous followers expanded the scheme with indefatigable energy—so that it is difficult to name a single subject which a Jesuit-pen has not attempted.

In the mathematics the Company ever continued to

¹ See the Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu for the list of the Company's writers.

produce minds of the highest order, although few, if any, of them enjoy, at the present day, that reputation which they so justly won in the times of the Company's glory. Need I repeat the mere names of these authors without a description of their labours? The history of Jesuit-literature would itself fill volumes—and not without interest and profit.

Galileo was a pupil of the Jesuits; and though thwarted by some of the body, still the Jesuits Riccioli and Grimaldi verified and supported his "hypothesis." Astronomers, philosophers, and geometricians, they investigated gravitation. Riccioli, with immense erudition, put forth a work, in which he combined all that had been contributed to the science of astronomy by the ancients and the moderns: he discovered and named the spots in the moon, whilst Grimaldi added five hundred stars to the catalogue of Kepler. Grimaldi put forth his treatise on light and the colours of the rainbow,¹ and the Jesuits claim the honour of having thus suggested to Newton the fundamental principles of his optics. The Jesuit L'Hoste, professor of mathematics in the royal school of Toulon, having passed much of his time on ship-board as chaplain, gave the world the results of his experience in useful treatises on navigation, naval architecture, naval evolutions, and a compendium of mathematics most necessary to an officer. For more than a century his treatises were indispensable in the navies of France, Holland, and England. The British midshipman thumbed this "Jesuit's book," as it was called, without running any risk of conversion. Other marine Jesuits sailed in the wake of L'Hoste; among the rest, Jean-Jacques du Chatellard gave thirty years of his

¹ "De Lumine et Coloribus Iridis."

life to the training of the young guards of the royal marine. Charles Borgo elucidated the “ Art of Fortification and the Defence of Places.”

Athanasius Kircher left nothing untried. Deeply initiated in Hebrew and other Eastern languages, he skimmed over the surface of all the sciences, not without occasional depth and penetration : perhaps he stumbled on Newton’s gravitation. Of extensive and varied erudition he was a copious writer ; but his judgment was defective : he lacked criticism, and jumped too hastily at conclusions, as we have seen with regard to his infernal hypothesis in the earth’s centre. It is said that he fancied he could resolve any question. Very credulous, as most of the learned Jesuits, his works present a strange medley of useful knowledge, applicable hints, ridiculous notions and devotional platitudes—and yet interesting throughout, from the numberless curious experiments which he describes with the utmost precision. His pupil Kestler published the sum of all his philosophical works in a folio volume, entitled *Physiologia Kircheriana Experimentalis*, which is worth perusal—a translation of the work, with corrections, would be highly advantageous to youth, by directing their curiosity to objects of science. It is illustrated throughout. Kircher collected a valuable museum of antiquities, which he left to the Roman College. In Kestler’s Compendium, before-named, there is a full description of it, with illustrations. In his *Polygraphia*, or the Artifice of Languages, he unfolds a method “whereby any one, with only his maternal language, might correspond with the natives of many other countries.” Of course the “*Tower of Babel*” engaged his attention, together with *Noah’s Ark*, whose architecture and construction he describes in

four books, superadding “curious investigations touching the state of things before the Deluge, during the Deluge, and after the Deluge”—all in a ponderous folio.¹ In the course of about forty years, he wrote and published more than forty volumes—many of them in folio ; and died at Rome in 1680, aged seventy-eight. These publications did not materially interfere in his educational avocation as a professor of philosophy and oriental languages at Würzburg, and of mathematics in the Roman College: this chair he filled for eight years, and then resigned it to devote himself exclusively to his favourite studies. *Bonhomie* and a striking self-complacency are the prominent expressions of his expanded German physiognomy, as exhibited in his portrait.

And the Company had her artists as well—painters, sculptors, architects. Jacques Courtois painted battles, Andrew Pozzo and others investigated the rules of perspective ; and even to the present time “The Jesuit’s Perspective,” according to Wolfius, “will answer your purpose, without engaging you in the intricacies of the *Theory*.”² To one of the Company’s painters, Daniel Seghers, a golden palette was presented by Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange, in attestation of the Jesuit’s skill and success. Father Fiammeri was a

¹ In his theory of universal language, Kircher applies his method to Latin, Italian, French, Spanish, and German. The vocabulary which he invented consists of about sixteen hundred words, and he expresses by signs to be agreed upon, the variable forms of verbs and nouns. The same work gives a treatise on *Stenography* or Short-hand Writing. Kings and nobles united to assist this indefatigable Jesuit, and even Protestant princes supplied him with money for the prosecution of his experiments, besides contributing to his museum all the curiosities they could collect.

² Wolf. *Element Mathææ*. The title of the book is “The Jesuit’s Perspective : an easy method of representing Natural Objects according to the Rules of Art,” with plates, 4to, 1765.

sculptor ; Raut, Massé, and the brothers Matlange, were architects ; whilst Father Ventavon, and the lay-brothers Paulus and Thibault, were distinguished clock-makers. Erasmus Marotta became “ a celebrated musician,” and Christopher Malter distinguished himself as a physician. And the Jesuits were the inventors of the air-balloon ! As early as 1631, Lana-Terzi had conceived the art of Montgolfier, whose practicability Leibnitz doubted, just as Davy ridiculed the idea of lighting up London with gas, and as Lardner scoffed at the notion of crossing the Atlantic by steam—which he lived to do himself a few years ago. Never was there an invention which was not at first laughed at—from the construction of Noah’s Ark down to the Electric Telegraph—which last, I have an idea, has its prototype in Kircher’s *Onomatomanthia Magnetica*, elaborately described and illustrated in the *Physiologia Kircheriana*. It was Lana-Terzi, also, who invented the sowing-machine, now in use on the Continent ; he it was who, a hundred years before the Abbé De l’Epée and Sicard, taught the method for teaching the deaf-and-dumb to write and converse, and fashioned the mysterious figures by which the blind can correspond with each other, and interchange their sentiments on all that their bereavement renders so interesting to their active minds and ever-glowing hearts.

Lana left the balloon without being able, for the want of means, to test the invention ; but another Jesuit, Gusmao, without having read Lana’s book, hit upon the same idea, and in the rich and glorious days of the Company, constructed the first balloon. It was in Brazil : he started forthwith for Lisbon with

his balloon, and offered to exhibit his experiment. The Portuguese Inquisition took alarm—the Jesuit made a joke of their perturbation, and, by way of encouragement, he told them laughingly, that if they liked, he would, at one stroke, raise up into air both the holy office and the grand inquisitor together! This was outrageous:—the people gave out that the Jesuit was possessed of a devil; and the inquisitors summoned him to their tribunal on a charge of magic. Vain was his defence of his invention, in which he boldly persisted: he was thrown into a dungeon; but his brother Jesuits succeeded in obtaining his liberation, or rather his escape from the hands of exasperated bigotry, at a time when doom was darkening on the fortunes of the Company.

Such were the labours of the Jesuits—wild and universal—a gorgeous phantasmagoria around the elements of ruin and destruction within, expanding, hand in hand, with all the outward glories of the Company of Jesus.



BOOK X. OR, BROUET.

IN 1640, the Company had celebrated her “secular year,” or centennial anniversary — “an infant of a hundred years.” Vast were the rejoicings of the members on that festive occasion. Numberless extravagant poems, emblems, allegories, besides the Imago, glorified the event with pomp and magnificence—all the world was forced to open its million eyes to the wealth, talent, and therefore *power*, of the imperial Company.

On that occasion, Vitelleschi, the general, addressed to the fathers and brothers of the Company a memorable epistle. It was, indeed, an occasion of triumph—a glorious jubilee for all ;—but prophetic sounds boomed, with the stifled muttering of the muffled horn, sounding

the dismal alarm in the morning watch of the camp, when the scouts have announced the enemy at hand.

After feelingly bewailing the tendency of mankind to make all the members of a body responsible for the crimes of a few, he urges the necessity to *act* upon the maxim ; quoting the words of Augustin—"What *thou* doest, the *Society* does, on whose account thou doest it, and whose son thou art." With strong words of earnest impeachment—and yet so *cautiously* that he prefers to quote old dead authors and Scripture, rather than bring a pointed accusation—he insists that the primeval ardour and spirit of the Society must be restored.

"Thy youth shall be renewed as the eagle's." On this theme he quotes a curious exposition of Augustin, giving the diagnosis of the eagle's disease ; to the effect that there happens to have grown on the tip of the beak of this queen of the birds a stony induration, the upper and lower beak being united by a sort of fleshy tie or membrane, so that they cannot open to feed : hence, says he, she is sorely distressed by the languor of old age, and pines away for the want of food. But, he adds, she is instructed by nature to retrieve her better days ; for, striking, and worrying, and rubbing the excrescence of her crooked beak against a stone, she wears away by degrees the morbid obstruction, and at length opens a way for food. Then she sets to, in right good earnest, enjoys her meal ; the vigour of all her members returns—her feathers shine again ; with the rudder of her wings she cleaves the upper air as before ; she becomes, after her old age, a young eagle.

Vitelleschi continues :—"I do not deny the truth of these observations ; let the authors whom Augustin reads answer for it. I am satisfied that somehow in this

manner, whether by the infirmity of age, or some carelessness on our part, an indescribable mass of affections, curved to the earth, and desires, is gathering on the lips of our hearts—whence, as it were by fleshy curbs,¹ the mouths of the mind are violently closed, so that they cannot be opened to heaven, and be refreshed by Divine food. The royal prophet lamented the same affliction in a different figure :—‘ I am stricken as hay, and my heart is dried up.’² Behold our languor and old age ! But what is the cause ? ‘ *Because I have forgotten to eat my bread.*’ * * * *

“ But whence can we suspect the cause of our insipidity in Divine things ?—our laborious irksomeness in recollection ?—in checking the wanderings of our vague imaginings, frequently tending to that direction which is least to be desired, because we have not repressed them when we could ? What is that tenacious and entangling love³ of the lowest objects—the world, honour, parents, and worldly comforts ? That greater authority conceded to the rebellious flesh and blood, rather than to the spirit—in *actions*, for I care nothing for *words*—that enervated, exhausted weakness in resisting the petitions of the adversary in our conflicts with the domestic enemy—perhaps not entirely yielding, but still not evidencing that alacrity and exaltation of mind to which the name of victory is given ? These are the fruits of tepidity and of a dissolute spirit ; which, unless it is raised betimes and warmed anew, is clearly approaching a fall and destruction.”⁴

Remissness in the superiors—the fear of giving offence

¹ “ *Carneis lupatis.*”

² The reader will remark this forced application of the text.

³ “ *Tenax amor et viscatus.*”

⁴ Epist. 4, Mutii Vitelleschi ; ed. Antwerp. 1665.

to the inferiors ; too great indulgence, favouritism, self-love, self-interest ;¹ excessive care and solicitude in worldly matters—such are the notes of preparation prophetic of a fall, that Vitelleschi kindly and considerately alludes to in this curious epistle,—“ which,” he says, to use his own expression, “ has been ploughed out of his own and inmost heart, and the very blood of his soul—for it would be his last to the Company.”² The conclusion is strong and urgent : “ I eagerly call all to witness, and proclaim to them that, with Bernard, I expect an answer to this epistle—but an answer of *deeds*, not words.”³ The letter is dated Nov. 15, 1639.

What a lamentable contrast is this letter to its contemporary, the *Imago*, whose representations of the Company we have just perused !

The exhortation had no effect :—the torrent was rushing on ; no human power could check or resist its violence.

From 1645 to 1649, the virtuous general of the Company, Vincenzo Caraffa, strove in like manner, and in vain, to forefend impending ruin. “ Caraffa was a man of little learning, but of extraordinary piety and devotion. He would never have a carriage for his use, nor be treated in any respect differently, as to food or raiment, from the humblest of the brethren :—as for others, he wished that the Jesuit-fathers would truly lead the lives of religious men, ceasing to meddle

¹ “ Privatus in seipsum amor cum proprii nominis, et commoditatum acriore studio conjunctus.”

² “ Utique scripta ex peculiari meo et intimo sensu, et animi sanguine exarata.”

³ “ Omnes cum B. Bernardo impatientius obtestor, iisque denuntio expectare me ad hanc epistolam benignitatis vestre responsum ; sed responsum facti, non verba.”

in politics and to frequent courts. The insurmountable difficulties he encountered in trying to effect this, were the primary cause of his death.”¹

Caraffa wrote an epistle to the Company, exhorting the fathers and brothers to “a preservation of the primeval spirit of the Company.” He pointedly alludes to infractions of the vow of poverty, dividing the various delinquents into five classes, and throwing some light on the various animal instincts which prevailed among the members. He indirectly alludes to the indiscriminate literary pursuits of the Jesuits, as contrary to the spirit of the Order ;—“for how monstrous will it be to consign the chalice, which is dedicated to the altar, to profane uses, following the example of the sacrilegious Balthasar ! But the matter is not a little more serious when the mind of a religious man is defiled by the refined knowledge of empty topics.” The following passage is very striking :—

“If you ask me, what it is to read unchaste books ; books conceived by the instinct of the evil spirit, composed and published in his own type, to indicate to men the way of destruction, as if it was not already known and precipitous ? [If you ask me this question] you will hear me repeat that it is to drink to the devil in the sacred cup ! It is to labour to gratify the devil and afflict God, as far as possible. For, if this proscribed reading of such books prevails in the world, how much more detestable is it in a religious man—in a Jesuit²—in a student of the sacred pages—in one who is appointed for the conversion of souls, and, by the function of his institute, for the defence of the faith ! Nor does the

¹ Diario, Deone, 12 Giugno, 1649, apud Ranke, who gives the original, p. 307, note.

² “In homine de Societate.”

excuse avail, namely, the language and eloquence of such books, whose brilliancy some allege as a cause of their reading—to acquire that recommendation.”¹

After pointing out the mighty evils that overwhelm the spirit by this practice, and alluding to profane, worldly conversation in general, Caraffa says :—

“Nor can I possibly pass over in silence, that these errors result, in a great measure, by the error of the superiors.”²

That the practice existed, may be evident from the following :—

“I speak particularly to our younger scholars, and I wish this exhortation to penetrate deeply in their minds ; but I enjoin the superiors, that, if they detect any one (which heaven forbid !) reading such books, or having them in his possession, let them, without admitting any excuse or intercession, send him at once back to the novitiate, there to imbibe the spirit of religious virtue, which he has not hitherto tasted.”

Some pertinent advice follows, such as to refrain from all worldly affairs—“they are not ours, they are foreign :”—*nostra non sunt, aliena sunt.*³

“Our procurators,” he says, “should be more *cautious* ; for although they seek what is just, by lawful right, still

¹ “Nec valet excusatio linguarum et eloquentiæ quarum inde nitorem se petere nonnulli causantur.”

² “Nec posse videor tacitus præterire, quæcunque hic errantur, magnam partem Superiorum errore venire.”

³ “Sunt nec toti spirituales,
Sunt nec toti seculares,
Sed in omnibus æquales.

“Eminent inter clericos,
Imperant inter laicos,
Excellunt inter aulicos.”

Jesuito-graphia, in Elixir Jesuiticum. Anno primi Jubilæi Jesuitici, 1645.

they seem to seek it with avarice and cupidity; and exhibit too much avidity that smells of the world.”¹

Nevertheless, I find in the “*Instructio pro Procuratore*” the following very pertinent language—in reading it one fancies it is the character of a griping attorney. “The office of procurator is defined under five heads. 1st. He must preserve the goods and rights of the college. 2ndly. He must take care that the revenues do not decrease, but rather be augmented. 3rdly. He must exact with the greatest diligence the debts that are owed to the college. 4thly. He must see that the goods and moneys be properly disposed of. 5thly. He must take care to be able to give an account of what he has received or delivered. Whence it is especially evident that to this function should be destined a very prudent, skilful, and faithful man, one who is not engaged in any other occupation which can impede his duty.” After this summary, a minute detail is given, most cleverly enumerating all the particulars to which he has to attend in his farming-book—the number of acres, quality of land, products of wheat, wine, olives, fodder, and wood, &c. “He must be present when the products are measured, sown, and collected, and when the vintage takes place, and the olives are pressed; and must not trust too much to the rustics. At the same time, he must get back what he has lent to the labourers, and must recover from

¹ *Avare et cupide videntur petere.*

“Sunt periti mendicantes,
Sunt quasi nihil habentes,
Et omnia possidentes.

“Opulentes civitates,
Ubi sunt commoditates,
Semper quærunť isti Patres.”—*Ubi suprà.*

other debtors at stated times, and must not be too indulgent,—for, by conceding a long delay in the payment of debts, it comes to pass at length that they are not paid at all.” And yet, this griping Procurator is, in the three last lines, told to confide in “Divine Providence”!¹ Caraffa concludes his epistle before quoted, in the following urgent obtestation :—

“I can add nothing more to this epistle, for *if this be done, it is sufficient,—si hoc fiat, sufficit*,—to renew the Society, and to restore her to her primitive complexion and health : but I again and again desire that these words should not vanish into air, but be ratified by deeds.” To aid them in this object, he strongly recommends “all to renovate and bring to perfection their piety in the worship of the most holy mother of God.”² They had praised her so much with their endless poems and treatises, that they “got sick of the subject.”³

Piccolomini succeeded to Caraffa. Instead of striving to stem the torrent, he anxiously shunned all vigorous

¹ Instruct. pro Administratione, &c.—Pro *Procuratore*. Corp. Instit. Soc. Jesu, ii. p. 243, et seq.

² Epist. R. P. N. Vincent, Caraffæ. Inst. Soc. Jesu, ii.

³ It was at this time that the Jesuit Melchior Inchofer petitioned the pope to effect a reformation in the Order, instancing twenty-nine abuses of various kinds. The pope suggested the matter to the Congregation which elected Caraffa, but nothing was done. Soon after there appeared a work entitled *Monarchia Solipsorum* ; or, *the Monarchy of Themselves alone*, allegorically but most systematically dissecting the whole state of the Jesuit-Order. It is an admirable performance, and could not have been written by any one not a Jesuit of considerable standing in the Company. Its effect was immense, and stirred the Jesuits with suspicions of a traitor. Suspicion fell on Inchofer, whom they resolved to banish and carry off to some distant locality. He was treacherously seized and hurried away by the emissaries of the Jesuits : but the pope being informed of the matter summoned Caraffa, who doubtless knew nothing of the matter, as he stated. Still, the pope commanded the immediate restoration of Inchofer, which was done accordingly. Of course, the Jesuit apologists deny the deed, but their *argumentation* is not conclusive against the *fact*. See the preface to the *Monarchie des Solipses* : Amsterdam, 1721.

and decisive measures, though naturally inclined to severity. He was frightened into submission to his aristocratical subjects, and only pondered how he might give satisfaction to his brethren of the Company. For by this time it was no longer advisable to attempt any change in the Order. Alessandro Goffredi, who succeeded in 1651, would fain have done this, and strove at least to set bounds to the aspiring ambition of the members; but the *two months* of his tenure of office were enough to bring upon him the universal detestation of the Company:—the Jesuits hailed his death as a release from tyranny. Still greater was the aversion which the next general, Goswin Nickel, drew down on himself. He could not be charged with contemplating any very sweeping measures of reform: he left things, on the whole, to go on as they were: only he was accustomed to adhere obstinately to opinions once adopted, and his demeanour was rude, discourteous, and repulsive; but this was enough to wound the self-love of powerful members of the Order so deeply and so keenly, that the General Congregation of 1661 proceeded to measures against him, the possibility of which we could scarcely anticipate from the monarchical theory of the Constitutions. They first begged permission of Pope Alexander VII. to associate with their general, a vicar with the right of succession. It was granted; and the Roman Court pointed out Oliva for the office, and the Order complacently elected that favourite of the palace. After some discussion as to the power which Oliva was to wield, it was decided that the general, Nickel, had forfeited all his authority, which was to be entirely transferred to the vicar; and then they inserted a mendacious decree in the decisions

of the Congregation, stating that Nickel had voluntarily asked to resign the authority, from ill-health and fatigue.¹ Thus it happened, that the Company, whose very first principle was unconditional obedience, itself deposed its chief, and that without any real transgression on his part. This was the climax of the aristocratical tendencies of the Professed—the burlesque of Loyola's Constitutions.² Now, what was the cause of this demonstration against Goswin Nickel? His denunciation of abuses. In 1653 he signalised “with grief” those members who were devising specious arguments for relaxing the vow of poverty. Decency and necessity, says he, were the pretexts, “names clearly innocent in themselves, and therefore adapted to deceive.” He says there were six hundred machinations of the devil whereby the Jesuits were endeavouring, with all their might, to subvert the vow of poverty. “But, although this true vanity and pride, under the false name of decency, may affect all, still they affect much more easily those who perform splendid functions, particularly those who frequent the courts of princes.”

After alluding to the love of individual comforts—inclination to particular places—he proceeds thus:—

“What shall I say of those who, when they are ordered to remove to another place, carry away so many moveables, that if one may judge the matter by the baggage, you would think that a whole family, not a single man, was migrating! Suppose one of the men of our ancient Society, not as yet acquainted with baggage and effects—were to meet these men thus burthened? Peter Faber, for instance, who returned the precious gifts of a

¹ Dec. XI. Congr. dec. I.

² Ranke, with contemporary vouchers, p. 307.

cardinal, saying that he was one of those who carry all their goods with them.”¹

Extravagance in the purchase of books calls for animadversion: “nor are those to be praised who consign the books which they have bought with the alms of pious men, to another college, and thus defraud the one wherein they happen to dwell.”

Intermeddling in the temporal affairs of their relatives—its sad effects—the difficulty of curing that disease—are feelingly brought forward.

“But what of those who, relinquishing the culture of the Lord’s field, and of their neighbours, turn themselves to the negotiation of worldly affairs?”

Extravagance has been lashed; its opposite vice, avarice, too, has unfortunately “crept in.”

“There are those who honour their hardness of heart and filth (the vice of their nature) with the name of economy and frugality; and whilst they are griping—*tenaces*—they wish to seem to be lovers of poverty. Hence they hoard up much, lay out little; clutch what they have, and dispense even what is necessary with a sparing hand; and, lest their inferiors should complain, they thrust in their faces everywhere, and lament the penury of the establishment.”²

Three years after, Nickel had written a desperate and stirring manifesto “to the fathers and brothers,” respecting “the pernicious provincial and national spirit” which had spread disunion in the Company. Nickel justifies the severity of his animadversions by the

¹ “Cum hoc fastu dignitatis
Junge votum paupertatis,
Et decus humilitatis.”

² Epist. i. R. P. N. G. Nickel.

numerous letters,—non unis literis,—which he had received on the subject, and admits his belief that the complaints and representations were substantially correct.¹ The forced resignation and real deposition of the general ensued as the result of these animadversions, which were discourteous to the lordly aristocracy.

General Oliva was a man who loved outward repose, good living, and political intrigue—and was therefore just the man for the Company. He had a villa not far from Albano, where he cultivated the rarest foreign plants, doubtless supplied by his numerous apostles all the world over. Even when in the city, he used to retire from time to time, to the novitiate-house of Santo Andrea, where he gave audiences to no one whatever. His table was furnished with none but the choicest meats.

“Indiæ galli, capones,
Turdi, lepores, pavones,
Sunt horum patrum bucones.

“Pingu carne vitulina,
Non bovina sed ovina,
Horum plena est culina.”

He never went abroad on foot : in his dwelling comfort was carried to an excessive degree of refinement.

“Claras ædes, bonum vinum,
Bonum panem, bonum linum,
Et pallium tempestivum.”

He enjoyed his position and his power :—assuredly such a man was not fitted to revive the ancient spirit of the Company. In fact, the Company was now daily departing from the principles on which it was founded.²

¹ “Ego quoque subesse aliquid, idque *non levis momenti*, tot querelis, scripti-
tionibusque suspicer.”—*Epist. ii. Gos. Nickel ; Corp. Instit. Soc. Jesu*, ii.

² Ranke, p. 308.

“ Vivunt unà joviales,
 Agunt dies feriales
 Quot optarent esse tales? ¹

“ Soliciti de gloriâ
 Semper et de pecuniâ
 Et augendâ familiâ.”

The members of the colleges had often more leisure than their relatives who were engaged in the active pursuits of life :—these members managed their business for them, collected their money, and carried on their lawsuits. But the mercantile spirit seized the colleges as well in their corporate capacity, as we have seen with regard to the English College at Rome. The Jesuits wished to secure their prosperity ; and, as large donations were no longer made to them, they endeavoured to make up for them by means of trade. Easily they found a “probable opinion” to justify the departure from their vows and Constitutions. The earliest monks had increased their wealth by tilling the ground, and so the Company might multiply her gold by trade and banking. The “Roman College” engaged in the manufacture of cloth at Macerata, at first only for its own use, then for that of all the colleges in the province, and finally for the public. Their agents attended the fairs. Their close connexion between the several colleges gave rise to a money-changing traffic or banking. The Portuguese ambassador at Rome was directed to draw upon the Jesuits of his own country. The transactions in the colonies were particularly prosperous ; the commercial connections of the order spread like a net over the two continents, having its centre in Lisbon.

¹ In a tract entitled *Specimens of Jesuit-Enjoyments—Deliciarum Jesuiticarum Specimina*, there is a glorious account of one of their banquets at the German College. “*Sic itur ad astra*,” &c. See *Arcana, Soc. Jesu*, p. 254, *et seq.*

Wherever there was a province, or a mission, there was Jesuit-traffic. This was a spirit which, when once evoked, necessarily affected the entire economy of the Order.¹

Still the Company held up the principle of giving gratuitous instruction. Presents however were accepted on the admission of pupils, as from the first, according to the distinct assertion of Hasenmüller. On certain festival occasions, occurring twice a year at least, wealthy pupils were welcomed by preference. On the benches there was always a marked distinction shown to the nobles—as expressly enjoined in the *Ratio Studiorum*.² Now the consequence of this was, that these youths felt a proportionate consciousness of independence, and would no longer submit to the strictness of the ancient discipline.

A Jesuit who raised his stick against his pupil was stabbed by him with a poniard. A young man in Gubbio, who was treated too harshly by the Father Prefect, killed him. Even in Rome, the commotions in the college were the incessant theme of conversation in the city and the palace. The Jesuit-teachers were once actually imprisoned a whole day by their pupils! The demand of these young insurgents was complied with—their rector was actually dismissed to please “the boys;” for the Jesuit-authorities had compromised themselves by many an act of base subservience, and they could not resist the authority thereby acquired over them by their pupils. In a word the influence of the Jesuits had passed its meridian;—they had taught mankind to suspect them of the basest motives in their

¹ Ranke, p. 308 ; Quesnel, i. ; Discours Prélim. 97, *et seq.*

² Reg. Prof. Studior. Inf. 29. “*Nobilibus commodiora subsellia.*”

pursuits and measures.¹ The violences of their college-pupils in Poland were frightful and notorious.

Low tricks and cunning then, more than ever, promoted the transient objects of the Jesuits. They strove to operate on all ranks of society, by means of agents more or less connected with the Company—men and women who bound themselves by vow, like the English priest, to some particular member or the whole Company, to be guided in all their actions by that authority, always ready to execute any command.² They

¹ Ranke, p. 308.

² In the early part of the 17th century men were amused with the concoction of a new Order of religious ladies, by the assistance of the Jesuit Roger Lee—another affliction to the English mission. Their project was to live in community, under certain vows, but without any obligation of enclosure,—to instruct young ladies,—and to ramble over the country; nay, even to the Turks and infidels, in order to “gain souls.” No wonder that “the Jesuits mainly supported their cause, and took great pains to obtain them an establishment.” They became notorious, and went by various names, such as English Jesuitesses, Wardists, from a Mrs. Ward, their foundress; also, Expectatives, from their expecting the papal approval of their Order; and lastly, they rejoiced in the appellation of “Apostolic Viragoes,” and “*Galloping Girls*,” with reference to certain “improper behaviour in those who were permitted to ramble abroad, upon the pretence of carrying on their interest.” It appears that these Jesuitesses of England knew how to enjoy life and dignity, as well as make vows and win souls. “Mrs. Mary Alcock,” says Tierney, “the first mother-minister of this institute, speaking of Mrs. Ward, says: ‘She came like a duchess to visit the Ignatian prisoners at Wisbeach, in a coach, attended with two pages riding with her in the said coach, and two or three attendants of her own sex;’ and she adds,—‘It is notorious that Mrs. Ward and her company lived at Hungerford House, in the Strand, very riotously, with excessive charge both for costly garments and dainty fare; not omitting to dress herself and the rest in the newest and most fantastical manner.’” In fact, it seems that they were a scandal to the mission, and justified the worst suspicions against them, when the English clergy memorialised the pope on the subject—not failing to urge the fact “that the Jesuits were expressly forbidden by their rules to meddle or mix in the government of women, and yet the Jesuitesses make use of the Jesuits alone, in all their concerns, in England and abroad, so that they seem to think it a crime to permit any other priest to hear the secrets of their conscience in confession.” In spite of opposition they besieged the pope with petitions for the confirmation of the Order; and it was then that they offered the “fourth vow” in behalf of the Turks and infidels: but so many “odd histories” were told of

were, for the most part, persons of the middle and upper ranks,—widows, and merchants (many of whom were veritable lay-brothers), and were enabled by their totally secular exterior, with the secret instructions



imparted by the Jesuits, to bring about those delightful windfalls, in the shape of donations or legacies, which might be piously set forth as “the blessings of a special Providence,” ever watchful for the wants of the fathers. Members who, for any particular purpose or by any necessity, were separated from the body, and still continued under its patronage, came under the same

them, that Pope Urban VIII., in 1630, suppressed the sisterhood, and sent the ladies to the world again, which, doubtless, they had never left.—*Tierney*, iv. Append. p. ccxxix. *et seq.*, and p. 111, note.

denomination. Thus, Father Maimbourg, one of the best historical writers of the Company, wrote against the court of Rome, in favour of the French clergy, then struggling against the papal pretensions. To punish the man, Pope Innocent XI. commanded the general to expel Maimbourg, who thenceforward, with a pension from the French king, and the Company's patronage, became a secularised Jesuit.¹

There was another class of men engaged in the pay of the Company, consisting of persons for whom the Jesuits obtained pensions, livings, or abbacies. Dispersed over Europe in every court, these men were of great service in building up the Jesuit-monarchy, and the constant agents in that systematic *espionage* which enabled the Jesuits to be always *prepared* for the disastrous events which were unavoidable. And by this artifice they managed to influence the affairs of Europe, so that "the greater part of all the transactions in Christendom passed through the hands of the Jesuits; and those only succeeded which were not opposed by the Jesuits."²

Among the manuscripts of the British Museum, there is a passport given by the Jesuits in 1650, for the consideration of 200,000 florins (10,000*l.*), to Hippolite Braem, at Gand, promising "to defend him against all infernal powers that might attempt on his person, his soul, his goods, and means."³

¹ This happened in 1682. Feller, xiii. 351. In the following year appeared a clever work entitled *Le Jésuite Sécularisé*, in the form of a dialogue between Maimbourg and a friend, who bitterly denounces the Jesuits. The book took effect, and the Jesuits soon put forth a denunciation of the stinging wasp.

² MS. Bibl. Harl. 3585, f. 371, entitled *Discrittione per Instruttione a' Principi, fatta da persona religiosa*. It enters into the whole régime of the Jesuits, towards the end of the 17th, and beginning of the 18th century.

³ MS. Bibl. Harl. 6895, f. 143. "Nous, soussignés, protestons et promettons

In positive fact, the enormous privileges granted, at their request, to the Jesuits by numerous popes, accelerated their downfall by facilitating abuse and perversion. The Jesuits might absolve sinners from any and every crime—from all ecclesiastical censures, pains, and penalties, with only two exceptions, of no material diminution to their power.¹

They might build churches, chapels, houses, anywhere and everywhere, and no one was to molest them in the enterprise. They might sell, exchange, or otherwise transfer all their property, moveables, and immoveables, present and to come, *pro illorum UTILITATE seu necessitate*—for their utility and necessities, to any persons, of every rank and condition—in other words, they might *trade*, traffic, barter, and sell.²

They might excommunicate those who presumed to leave the Company, as we have seen. There is no appeal from the chastising power of the Company. Powers before confined to bishops, such as the consecration of churches, vestments, and the like, were conceded to the Jesuits. Whoever seized the goods or money of the Company, or belonging to persons connected with it, whether colleges or houses, unless restoration be made

en foi de prestres et de vrais religieux, au nom de notre Compagnie à tel effet suffisamment autorisés, qu'elle prend maistre Hippolite Braem, licentié en droit sous sa protection, et promet de le défendre contre toutes puissances infernales qui pourraient attenter sur sa personne, son âme, ses biens, et ses moyens, que nous conjurons et conjurerons pour cet effet, employans dans ce cas, l'autorité et crédit du Sérénissime Prince notre fondateur, pour être le dit Le Braem par lui présenté au bienheureux chef des apôtres, avec autant de fidélité et d'exactitude comme notre dite Compagnie lui est extrêmement obligée. En foi de quoi nous avons signé cet, et y apposé le cachet de la Compagnie. Donné à Gand, le 29 Mars, 1650. Souscrit par le recteur Seclin et deux prêtres Jésuites." Raumer has published this document in his valuable *Hist. of the 16th and 17th Centuries*, ii. 436, *note*.

¹ Compend. Privileg. *Absolutio*.

² *Ubi suprâ*, *Alienatio*.

in three days, incurred the penalty of excommunication. The Jesuits might commute or compound for all vows—might “relax” each other’s oaths, “without prejudice of a third party”—a proviso left entirely to the decision of the absolver. They might impose censures, penalties, even pecuniary fines on all who rebelled against them or otherwise offended, when they were constituted judges and conservators—they might even place a country under an “interdict” or minor excommunication. Their power to absolve in cases of homicide, and to grant dispensations in downright murder, has been already quoted. In the matter of the tender passions they had important powers of dispensation.¹ It is necessary to remember, that, according to Escobar, “a dispensation is an act of jurisdiction whereby any one is exempted from the obligation of a law, or by which the obligation of a law is suspended.” Immunity was granted to all who took refuge in their churches, and all persons were prohibited from laying hands on such fugitives, under penalty of excommunication. In the word churches, says the privilege, are included colleges, houses, gardens, offices, all places.

Numerous indulgences were granted to the Jesuits for the performance of the most trivial actions; also to the fathers and mothers of the Jesuits, were they even in Purgatory,—*in Purgatorio existentes*.

Under penalty of excommunication all are forbidden to impugn the “Constitutions,” &c.

Even during the time of an Interdict, the Jesuits could open their doors, say mass, hear confessions, &c.

¹ “Dispensare ad petendum debitum cum iis qui consanguineum aut consanguineam sui conjugis, post matrimonium carnaliter,” &c.—*Ubi supra*, *Dispensatio*, 8; see also 9, 10.

Hence it is evident that their conduct in resisting the Venetian government was not a necessity on them, as papal subjects.

Such were a few of the privileges of the Company.¹ The Jesuits had all the strong passions of men, as we have seen affirmed by their own generals as well as by facts; they had the power of bishops in their professional march through the world; they were omnipotent in the confessional by their specious and accommodating casuistry. And now those extravagant opinions of the Jesuit-teachers arrested attention.

In 1651, Piccolomini sent forth his *Ordinatio* respecting the questions that might and might not be mooted by Jesuits. In the introduction to this mandate, he says:—

“There are not wanting serious complaints from the various provinces, respecting certain teachers of philosophy and divinity, both in the Eighth and Ninth congregation.”²

A list of permitted and forbidden topics is subjoined—all curiously illustrative of “the activity of the Jesuit-mind” at that period—mere trifles and momentous questions following each other in admirable confusion: the diurnal motion of the earth, and the motion of the planets being among the *proscribed* topics. The “hypothesis” had not yet become a “theory.”

Six “other propositions” are superadded—not that he believes any member of the Society has taught them—but because they have been “*brought forward by the deputies.*” The first proposition is the following: “God is the cause of sin.” All the other five propositions

¹ See the *Compendium Privilegiorum*, Corpus Instit. Soc. Jesu. ii.

² *Ordinatio pro Studiis Superioribus.*

refer to the attributes of the Divinity. The general continues :—

“However, we do not at all censure all the aforesaid propositions ; but we only forbid them to be taught in our schools—for the sake of greater uniformity, and more solid and copious fruit in the hearers : nor should the authority of any authors be alleged, if perchance any of these propositions be found in their works, or in the books already published by our men, even with some approbation—for it were to be wished that *many of the Revisors had been more diligent and severe.*”¹

It follows from what we have read, that the conscientious or more *prudent* members of the Society were seriously alarmed by the extravagance of opinions that had begun to characterise the Jesuits.

The Jesuits are fond of quoting *Voltaire* in their defence. The authority is suspicious : it has just about as much weight in the question as the authority of Jack Sheppard would have when quoted by a highwayman in his own defence. In a letter which Voltaire wrote to a Reverend Father, alluding with considerable pungency to the Provincial Letters of Pascal, he says :—

“*De bonne foi*, is it by the ingenious satire of the Provincial Letters that we should judge of the morality of the Jesuits ? Assuredly, it is by Father BOURDALOUE, by Father CHEMINAIS, by their other preachers, by their missionaries.”²

I would agree with Voltaire, if I could permit myself the mental reservation, *subintelligendo*, as to the *public* morality of the Jesuits.

Was it at all likely that a public preacher would dare to hold forth, in the pulpit, such doctrines as Escobar,

¹ Ibid. *ut antea*.

² Lettre de Volt., au Père La Tour.

Hurtado, Salas, Busembaum, &c., infused into the young confessors of the Society for inculcation in the *confessional*?

Herein is the terrible peculiarity of this Society ; that its moral needle, turning on the pivot of expediency, points to heaven and hell, as steadily as the magnetic needle points to the north and south.

It is the *good* inextricably blended with the *evil* that stamps the Jesuit-system with its unenviable originality.

Again, if the men whose immoral opinions and permissions were denounced, had been *profligate* in their outward conduct, we might be disposed to overlook the evil, as bereft of influence ; thus rendered, comparatively, impotent by the acknowledged character of the authors. But the case is different. The Jesuit-casuists were men of “character” in the Society : Escobar died an “exemplary” member of the Society of Jesus !

What reason could an “exemplary” teacher have for inculcating “rather lax opinions ?” He shall tell you himself.

“But if I often seem to adhere to rather lax opinions, that is not to define what I think myself, but to put forth what the learned shall be able to apply practically, without a scruple, whenever it shall seem *expedient* to quiet the minds of their penitents ?”

Another question—what proof have we that others before him inculcated these “rather lax opinions ?”

Again he shall answer :—

“This I candidly declare, that I have written nothing in the whole book that I have not received from some *Doctor of the Society of Jesus*.”

Consequently his book has the “Approbation, License, Consent, and Permission” of the respective functionaries,

and professes to be an exposition of the opinions, in cases of conscience or casuistry, of *twenty* doctors of the Society, for the instruction of young confessors—in Questions and Answers.

In this stage of the Company, it was no longer her aim to subjugate the world, or to imbue it with the spirit of religion : rather had their own spirit stooped to the world's ways ; their only endeavour was to make themselves indispensable to mankind, effect it how they might. And strange it was to see, that, by the very tribunal of confession, which had been their first fulcrum of power, they began their universal downfall. To say that the *object* of the Jesuits was to corrupt mankind, would be as unjust as it is improbable : but that such must be the result if their confessional doctrines were carried into practice, is beyond all contradiction. Unquestionably, such principles as the casuists inculcate, very often lead mankind ; but far from striving to set such consciences at rest, the guardians of religion should ever uphold the strictest and simplest doctrine of moral integrity—leaving the consciences of individuals to themselves and their Creator. Now, “according to the doctrine of the Jesuits,” says Ranke, “it is enough only not to will the commission of a sin *as such* : the sinner has the more reason to hope for pardon, the less he thought of God in the perpetration of his evil deed, and the more violent was the passion by which he felt himself impelled : custom, and even bad example, inasmuch as they restrict the freedom of the will, avail in excuse. What a narrowing is this of the range of transgression ! Surely no one loves sin for its own sake. But, besides this, they admit other grounds of excuse. Duelling, for instance, is by all means forbidden by the

Church ; nevertheless, the Jesuits are of opinion, that if any one incur the risk of being deemed a coward, or of losing a place, or the favour of his sovereign, by avoiding a duel ; in that case he is not to be condemned, if he fight.¹ To take a false oath were in itself a grievous sin : but, say the Jesuits, he who only swears outwardly, without inwardly intending it, is not bound by his oath ; for he does not swear, but jests.² These doctrines are laid down in books which expressly profess to be moderate. Now that their day is past, who would seek to explore the further perversions of ingenuity to the annihilation of all morality, in which the propounders of these doctrines vied, with literary emulation, in outdoing each other. But it cannot be denied that the most repulsive tenets of individual doctors were rendered very dangerous through another principle of the Jesuits, namely, their doctrine of ‘probability.’ They maintained that, in certain cases, a man might act upon an opinion, of the truth of which he was not convinced, provided it was vindicated by an author of credit.³ They not only held it allowable to follow the most indulgent teachers, but they even counselled it. Scruples of conscience were to be despised ; nay, the true way to get rid of them, was to follow the easiest opinions, even though their soundness was not very certain.⁴ How strongly did all this tend to convert the most inward and secret promptings of

¹ Busembaum, lib. iii. tract. iv. cap. 1. dub. 5. art. 1. n. 6.

² “Qui exterius tantum juravit sine animo jurandi, non obligatur, nisi, forte, ratione scandalı, cum non juraverit, sed luserit.”—*Busemb.* lib. iii. tract. ii. dub. 4. n. 8.

³ Em. Sa. Aphorism. Confess.

⁴ Busemb, lib. i. c. 2. “Remedia conscientie scrupulosæ sunt 1. Scrupulos contemnere. Assuefacere se ad sequendas sententias mitiores et minus etiam certas.”

conscience into mere outward deed. In the casuistic manuals of the Jesuits all possible contingencies of life are treated of, nearly in the same way as is usual in the systems of civil law, and examined with regard to their degree of veniality: one needs but to open one of these books, and regulate himself in accordance with what he finds there, without any conviction of his own mind, to be sure of absolution from God and the Church. A slight turn of thought unburthened from all guilt whatever. With some sort of decency, the Jesuits themselves occasionally marvelled how easy the yoke of Christ was rendered by their doctrines!"¹

And such was the turn of events. That Company, which went forth to restore Catholicism, became at length the corrupter of all morality—led away by that mental extravagance which was the result of the position in which she was placed by events and her bruited successes. How strangely sound the following sentiments, from the lips of a member of that Company which undertook to present models of ascetic perfection! Listen to Father Lemoine painting a rigid Christian of the school which opposed the Jesuits. "He is without eyes for the beauties of art and nature. He would believe that he has laden himself with an irksome burthen, if he has indulged in any pleasure. On festival days he walks among the tombs. He prefers the trunk of a tree, or a grotto, to a palace or a throne. As for affronts and injuries, he is as insensible to them, as if he had the eyes and ears of a statue. Honour and glory are idols which he knows not, and to which he has no incense to offer. A beautiful woman is a spectre to his eyes. And those imperious and haughty visages,

¹ Ranke, 309.

those agreeable tyrants who everywhere make voluntary slaves, and without chains, have the same power over his eyes as the sun has over those of the owl.”¹

Nine editions of Escobar's objectionable casuistry, entitled *Moral Theology*, rapidly succeeded each other,—an evidence that they were adapted to the age,—and, perhaps, that the Jesuits were preparing those moral convulsions which ended in the Revolution, to continue ever after down to the present epoch of French history. What an example to Revived Catholicism was that, when the Jesuit Cheminot, confessor to Charles IV., Duke of Lorraine, permitted his ducal penitent to have two wives together! Nay, he boldly did more. In the face of public scandal, he stubbornly defended his conduct with argument; persisted, in defiance of papal mandates and the repeated remonstrances of Vitelleschi, to live at the ducal court, with the bold voluptuary and his concubine. At last he was excommunicated, and he submitted to the general,—but not before six long years had continued to brand his Company with indelible disgrace. It was currently affirmed that fourteen Jesuit-doctors had sided with the duke and his accommodating confessor;—nor have we any reason to doubt the probability, considering the immoral extravagance of the casuistical notions then prevailing in the Company.²

Under Louis XIV. of France, the glorious king of ginger-bread and tinsel, the Jesuit La Chaise, his confessor, winked at the voluptuary's disorders, and by

¹ See Capefigue on this subject for a very fantastic view of Jesuit-casuistry. He quotes Lemoine in support of his view.—*Louis XIV.* i. chap. 5.

² See Cretineau, iii. 455, *et seq.*, for an account of the transaction, which he endeavours to shift from the Company to the member exclusively.

position, at least, exhibited the horrible connexion between religion and vice. They called him an "easy chair," punning on his name, but really asserting an evident fact—for there was the king wallowing in adulterous profligacy, with his Jesuit-confessor always at hand, excepting when he was enjoying his delightful villa at Ménilmontant, where, like the general Oliva, he cultivated his rarest plants, strawberries from the east, beautiful peaches of Bagdad, and pears from England.

His noble figure, so interesting to behold, his soft and pliant character, polished and insinuating, that apparent simplicity and candour which concealed the politician, captivated the king, over whom La Chaise achieved a lordly ascendant. In recompense for his method of morality, which "conciliated salvation with that life of weakness and propensity which God has left in the heart of man," the king yielded every temporal blessing to the Company which had vouchsafed him such a guide to heaven, through the swamps of sensuality. Whilst he presided over the royal distribution of all the benefices, he procured for his Company a multitude of very rich ones, often without the usual formalities—a *vivæ vocis oraculum* being sufficient to enrich the excessively poor and needy Jesuits, and displayed himself a brilliant equipage, with sumptuous banquets—not without criminal gallantry, if contemporary descriptions may be credited to the extent which the Jesuits demand for their edifying and curious letters."¹

¹ See the "History of Father La Chaise," vol. ii., "containing the most secret particulars of his life : his amours with several ladies of the highest quality ; and the pleasant adventures that befell him during the whole course of his gallantries." "From the French original." London, 1695.

Never, throughout man's history, was there moral relaxation without its counteracting rigour of conduct and inculcation. The Puritans in England were justly roused by the abuses of a Protestant Church Establishment sinking more and more into Romanism :—a weak-minded king, incessantly tampering with Rome, as proved by the memoirs of Panzani, the papal envoy to England, paid the penalty of prevarication with his death on the scaffold.¹ Thus the Jansenists of France, with their rigid conduct and maxims, rose up to oppose the lax morality of the Jesuits. It was then that Pascal transfixed the Jesuits with the slashing sword of his *Provincial Letters*, which may be styled the "hand-writing on the wall" against the Company of Jesus.² But bitterly did the Port-Royalists feel the vengeance of their rivals, in possession of the king's bad conscience. The very nuns whom they directed, were included in one vast and whelming destruction. Unsatiated by the calamities of the nuns, the vengeance of the enemies of Port-Royal was directed against the very buildings where they had dwelt, the sacred edifice where they had worshipped, and the silent tombs in which their dead had been interred. The monastery and the adjacent church were overthrown from their foundations. Workmen, prepared by hard drinking for their mission, broke open the graves in which the nuns and recluses of former times had been treasured in their rest. With obscene ribaldry, and outrages too disgusting to be

¹ See "Berington's Memoirs of Panzani," for a full account of the transactions and the doings of the Jesuits throughout the whole period of the machination—their continued opposition to the clergy of their own communion—just as in the days of Parsons.

² For an admirable description of the *Provincial Letters*, see the "Edinburgh Review," vol. lxxiii. p. 341.

repeated, they piled up a loathsome heap of bones and corpses, on which the dogs were permitted to feed. What remained was thrown into a pit, prepared for the purpose, near the neighbouring church-yard of St. Lambert. A wooden cross, erected by the villagers, marked the spot where many a pilgrim resorted, to pray for the souls of the departed, and for his own. At length no trace remained of the fortress of Jansenism to offend the eye of the Jesuits, or to perpetuate the memory of the illustrious dead with whom they had so long contended.¹ Was there no retribution thereupon made necessary?

And thus had the Jesuits done, throughout their career in every region of the globe. One of their most recent persecutions, before that transaction, was the fate of the venerable Palafox, a catholic bishop, who resisted their practices in their missions. In bitterness of heart and from the midst of his sufferings, he wrote to Pope Innocent X. craving justice and defence—driven from his diocese by the Jesuits, and compelled to flee to the mountains.²

And a change came over the spirit of the royal voluptuary. Madame de Maintenon converted him when his passions were nearly exhausted. When Peter the Great, on his visit at Paris, got leave to visit this woman in her decrepit old age, he merely drew aside her bed-curtain, gazed upon her—and turned upon his heels, uttering never a word. Her character is, indeed, a mystery still; and if, according to the Jesuit Feller,

¹ Reuchlin, *Geschichte von Port-Royal*, “*Edinburgh Review*,” vol. lxxiii. p. 361. The reader will find in that article a full and most interesting account of the subject.

² See *Vie du Venerable Dom Jean de Palafox*, *passim*. Ed. Cologne, 1767.

her glorious exaltation was predicted to her by an astrological stone-mason, it is another instance of "celestial" ends brought about by human nature. The frightful persecution of the Huguenots, with the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—civil degradation, social proscription, ruin, and expatriation—these were results which the Jesuits might exult in—but another doom impended thereupon—the tree of the French Revolution was planted long before, and now it was growing, nurtured by the Jesuits—for, to quote a writer who gives the Jesuits credit for policy in their moralities,—what did Pascal lay to the charge of the Company? "He reproaches the Jesuits for not enjoining rigid fastings, macerations, everlasting penances—for permitting loans on interest, vast commercial gains, the propensities of the heart indulged in a life where all is propensity; for not rigidly enforcing the Christian law, when all the principles of social life consisted in a mere approximation of man's sensualism to that inflexible law. I know of nothing more illiberal than the Provincial Letters, the meditations of a mind which declaims against the morals of the age."¹ Now the whole of these points were directly signalling the propensities which evolved the *French Revolution*. And they were promoted, encouraged by the Jesuits, *quondam* restorers of Catholicism:—when subsequently a Jesuit predicted the downfall of religion in France, 'mid the horrors of the Revolution, it was a sort of providential conviction from the lips of a member of that Company, whose wildness of intellectual extravagance, and moral inculcations had made the religion of the land a scoffing and a jest.²

¹ Capefigue, Louis XIV. i. 200.

² See Alison, Hist. of Europe, i. c. ii.

La Chaise died. The Jesuit Le Tellier stepped into his place, and undertook the royal conscience. Dark, gloomy,—ardent, inflexible, impetuous,—hiding his violence beneath a cold exterior—full of roguish contrivance ; such was Le Tellier. He persecuted and tormented the Cardinal de Noailles for his repugnance to the Company ; in the bitterness of his fate, Maintenon turned her back upon her friend, and left him at the mercy of the Jesuit in the conscience of the king. Le Tellier procured the famous Bull *Unigenitus* to be demanded from the pope by Louis XIV., whose only effect was to exasperate the dissensions in the Gallican Church, adding to the growing contempt in the nation's intellect, for the religion of the land. It was Le Tellier whose ferocious mind drove the plough over the ruins of Port Royal, and roused a tempest of foes against his Company—never to be satisfied until she sank in the gulf of a whelming retribution. Who has not heard of the “Roguery of Douay, or the false Arnauld—*La fourberie de Douai, ou le faux Arnauld ?*” Le Tellier was its contriver.¹

¹ In 1690, during a dispute, M. de Ligny, Professor of Philosophy at the Royal College at Douay, fell out with Father Beckman, a Jesuit-professor. Driven to extremities in the argument, he menaced his opponent with revenge, saying : *Ego te flagellabo*—I'll give you a whipping. Fifteen days after, Ligny received a letter under the false signature of *Antoine A * * ** ; that is, *Antoine Arnauld*, with an address for the expected answer. Arnauld was the great Jansenist opponent of the Jesuits, joint author in the *Morale Pratique*, which dissects the Company with searching acuteness, numerous facts, and general fairness. Now, the professor, flattered by the honour of receiving a letter from so famous a man as Arnauld, replied to the letter, and continued the correspondence—so that at last, the impostor, under the name of Arnauld, drew from Ligny the names of those who opposed the Jesuits, all of them doctors and professors in theology. The impostor thereupon began and continued a correspondence with these doctors, who supposed they were writing to the true Arnauld, the staunch opponent of Jesuit-doctrine. Ligny even begged the invisible Arnauld to be his spiritual director, and sent him a general confession of the state of his conscience. Here-

In England, Catholicism had won a sort of support in James II. Jesuit-schools were opened : the Jesuit Petre was actually made a privy councillor : the pope was requested urgently by the king to make the Jesuit a bishop, but the pope rejected the supplication. The Prince of Orange and Protestantism came over very soon after, and James took refuge under the wings of the devout King of France, and there he died "in the odour of sanctity."

Let the scene be shifted once more. The evening is come : night will soon follow ; and after that a morning will return to the Company.

I have studied the quarrel of Jansenism, and have found nothing in it adapted to develop the object of this work ; namely, the system of the Jesuits. The *Provincial Letters* only accelerated events which the Jesuits themselves, unwittingly, had been preparing during the course of the preceding century. They had given an impulse to the age by their universal development of education ; intellectuality was in the ascendant. A similar process has, in the present age, been in operation for the last fifty years or more. The idea of universal equality, or the "levelling" mania, is one of the abuses of intellect, trained without the moral sentiments being raised to pilot the adventurous bark on the trackless ocean of mind. The pursuit of knowledge, after the example, or

upon he was induced to leave his chair, his benefice, and to send all his papers to the impostor, whilst he set out, by the same command, to a place appointed, which was Paris. He went to St. Magloire, but found no Arnould, proceeded from place to place, until at last the simple Fleming found that he was duped. Meanwhile, however, all the *professors* before alluded to were denounced by the Jesuit Le Tellier, and exiled to various towns of France ; and Ligny himself was sent to Tours. Of course the affair made a great noise : the Jesuits denied their share, of course ; but it is now even admitted by the Jesuit Feller in his "Universal Biography," art. *Le Tellier*.

under the sanction of the great educators, had become a mania : the result was that yearning after change which flatters the heart with the accomplishment of every desire. At the present day, are we not hurrying to the same result ?

In the case of the Jesuits, novelty had lost its charm ; Escobar, Busembaum, and other “ moralists ” of the Society had been made to cover the Jesuits with shame or suspicion,—the finger of scorn was raised with impunity. Their name became a term of reproach ; every language had consecrated it to fraud, cunning, and duplicity. It is hard to battle against ridicule and evil fame when deserved.

Portugal was the first kingdom in which the influence of the Jesuits became paramount : it was the first effectually to strike it down. If Philip II. humbled Portugal by the aid of the Jesuits,¹ the vengeance of Pombal was a fearful retribution—such as may be ever and anon recognised in the history of man, and especially in the history of the Jesuits.

In 1753, the kings of Spain and Portugal made an exchange of provinces in South America : the inhabitants respectively were to change territories. The religious subjects of the Jesuits refused to obey. I applaud the conduct of these men, if they thought they could resist with effect ; for, unquestionably, the mandate was tyrannical. On the other hand, it was to be expected that the “ mother country ” would enforce the demand ; and the result was the destruction of this Jesuit-republic. The Jesuits deny that they aided the Indians with their advice and martial science ; they deny that they stimulated them to resistance ;—if there

¹ Rabbe et Chatelain, *Hist. de Portug.*

was no chance of success, the denial is probably correct.

Pombal followed up this first assault. Strange! that such a man should proclaim, as the motive of his persecution of the Jesuits, that "they had remained less faithful than their predecessors to the principles of Ignatius!"¹

The Jesuits were expelled from Portugal and its dependancies. In 1728 they had been banished from Savoy.

The Jesuits lent themselves to the infamous Abbé Dubois, whose promotions they worked for like hearty servants, and scandalised the world by making a bishop and a cardinal of the Catholic Church, out of an unscrupulous libertine and unprincipled intriguer. The Jesuits Lafitau and the bishop of Sisteron, were the man's emissaries at Rome, and nothing can exceed in disgusting baseness their practices on the wretched pope, whom they menaced and bribed alternately. All the princes of Europe were stirred to get the abbé made a cardinal—among the rest his Britannic Majesty, George I.²

In 1764, the sons of Ignatius were expelled from France. This event is certainly connected with an offended woman, Madame de Pompadour. Her confessor

¹ Saint Priest, Fall of the Jesuits.

² See *Mémoires Secrètes du Cardinal Dubois*, par M. De Sevelinges, t. i. pp. 275 and 297. "Il me serait impossible," writes Destouches from the English Court, "de vous exprimer l'empressement de milord Stanhope à exécuter ce que vous avez souhaité, et la joie avec laquelle le roi de la Grande Bretagne s'est employé en cela pour votre satisfaction. En vérité, le maître et les ministres vous aiment de tout leur cœur, et ne sont jamais plus ravis que lorsqu'ils peuvent vous le témoigner; mais il faut avouer que vous avez en milord Stanhope un ami, dont le zèle et l'attachement pour vous sont sans borne," &c., addressed to Dubois, 30th Jan., 1720. Throughout the work, the Jesuit Sisteron plays a conspicuous part. His letters to Dubois are very curious, but not edifying.

De Sacy, a Jesuit, refused to sanction what she styled her “purest attachment for the king, Louis XV.” The reader, who is aware that Father Cotton, another Jesuit, was confessor to the tender-hearted *Henry IV.*, and who has probably read the curious *Historiettes* of Talletment des Réaux, will be pleased to see this contrast of affairs. The lady resolved on the expulsion of the Order, and was successful. Previously to this, the Company had become the laughing-stock of Paris by the affair of Father Gerard, one of the Jesuit-rectors, in the case of a misguided woman whose ambition was to rival St. Catherine of Sienna with her stigmata or sympathetic wounds. She accused the father of immoral conduct towards her—in fact, seduction ; a trial took place ; the Jesuit was acquitted by the majority of a single vote. It is impossible to pronounce upon his innocence or his guilt from the accounts set forth in thirty-eight memoirs, and printed in a huge folio, bound in calf, with gilt edges. Great must have been the interest excited, to warrant so expensive a publication. Pamphlets, songs, logic, and sarcasm, swarmed like a nest of hornets—the Jesuits were become contemptible. Voltaire, a pupil of the Jesuits, D’Alembert, all the “philosophers” were in the zenith of their fame. The Jesuits cannot speak of their downfall without stigmatising the “philosophers ;” for my part, I believe that the Jesuits prepared their own destruction : they have the merit of having ruined themselves. Besides, their Fathers Berruyer and Hardouin and many others had roused incredulity by their extravagances—and the same may be said of their intellectual education with its external devotions.

The affair of Lavalette supervened,—another lever

of destruction. This Lavalette was the Jesuit-procurator of the West India missions. Jesuit-missionaries in South America had endeavoured to ameliorate the condition of the poor African, but Lavalette *owned* slaves in Dominica. An epidemic disease broke out among his negroes, and several died. In addition to this the English cruisers took his freighted ships—he became a bankrupt for a large sum, which the Society *refused to pay*. This was a fatal imprudence in the Jesuits, or the result of deception; they suffered the matter to go before the French Parliament, and were condemned to pay the full amount of the debt.

Louis XV., “wearied out rather than convinced,” yielded to the solicitations of Madame de Pompadour and Choiseul, his minister; the Jesuits were expelled.

In 1767, the Jesuits were suddenly and unexpectedly driven out of Spain by Charles III., a pious, zealous, most Catholic sovereign, if history is to be credited. This act took the Jesuits totally to windward—it mystified even them; and to this day the motives that dictated their expulsion from Spain remain inexplicable, if we may not believe the exclamation of the King, alluding to a frivolous revolt some time before, which the Jesuits suppressed so easily that they were suspected of having fomented it. The King is said to have declared “that if he had any cause for self-reproach, it was for having been too lenient to so dangerous a body;” and then, drawing a deep sigh, he added, “I have learned to know them too well!”¹

I pass over the sufferings of the Jesuits; their utter dereliction by all who had before been served by them, when, on the same day, and at the same hour,—in Spain,

¹ Dispatches of the Marq. of Ossun to Choiseul, quoted by Saint Priest.—*Fall of the Jesuits.*

in the north and south of Africa, in Asia and America, in all the islands of the Spanish monarchy—the alcades of the towns opened the dispatches which they received from Madrid, commanding them, under penalty of death, to enter the establishments of the Jesuits, armed, to take possession, to expel them, and transport them, within twenty-four hours, as prisoners, to such port as was mentioned. The latter were to embark instantly, leaving their papers under seal, and carrying away with them only a breviary, a purse, and some apparel. “Nearly six thousand priests, of all ages and conditions—men illustrious by birth and learning—old men oppressed with infirmities, despoiled even of the most indispensable requisites—were stowed away in the hold of a ship, and sent adrift upon the ocean, with no determinate object, and without any fixed direction.”¹ They neared the coast of Italy ; the pope refused to receive them. What were his motives for this apparently unchristian act in the father of the faithful ? Perhaps their numbers suggested the fear of famine ! If Ricci, their general, as is alleged, joined in or suggested the refusal, it was a sad indiscretion at a time when the reputation of the Society was at its lowest ebb.²

¹ Saint Priest.

² “Of course the utmost secrecy was observed in the execution of the mandate, and it is a well authenticated fact, that in Peru, with the exception of the viceroy and his agents, no one knew anything of the affair. But the same ship which conveyed the king’s commands to the viceroy, had on board the necessary instructions to the vicar-general in Lima, from the superior of the Jesuits in Madrid, who was fully acquainted with the king’s design. The preparatory arrangements were made under the seal of perfect secrecy, and at ten o’clock at night the viceroy assembled his council, and communicated to them the royal commands. It was determined that no one should be permitted to leave the council-chamber until the blow was struck. At midnight some confidential officers, with the requisite assistance, were dispatched to arrest the Jesuits, an accurate list of whose names lay on the table before the viceroy. The patrols knocked at the gate of San Pedro, the *Colegio Maximo* of the Jesuits, an establishment possessed of enormous revenues, for all the finest plantations and best

The Courts of France and Spain now determined to effectuate the total abolition of the Society of Jesus, by the pope himself!

After long and tedious negotiations on the part of the respective potentates, nothing was done in the matter : the death of the Pope Clement XIII. raised the hopes of those princes bent on the destruction of the Jesuits.

houses in Lima were the property of the Order. The gate was immediately opened. The commanding officer desired to see the vicar-general, and the porter ushered him into the great hall of the convent, where all the members of the Order were assembled, evidently expecting his visit. The holy brethren were prepared for immediate departure, each being provided with a bag or trunk containing such articles as were requisite on a sea-voyage. Similar preparations had been made in all the other houses of the Jesuits. The surprise and disappointment of the viceroy on receiving this information may be more easily conceived than described. Without delay he ordered the whole brotherhood to be conducted under a strong escort to Callao, where they embarked. In the course of a few days inventories were made of the effects in the houses. At San Pedro it was expected that vast treasures in specie would be found ; but how great was the dismay, when instead of the millions which it was well known the Order possessed, only a few thousand dollars could be collected ! All the keys, even of the treasury, were politely laid out in the chamber of the superior. This was a cruel mockery ! The Jesuits could not have taken a more ample revenge on the treachery which had been practised on them. It was suspected that the treasures were concealed partly in the house of San Pedro, and partly in the plantations. According to the evidence of an old negro at that time in the service of the convent, he, together with some of his comrades, were employed during several nights in carrying heavy bags of money into the vaults of the house. Their eyes were bandaged, and they were conducted by two of the brethren, who helped them to raise and set down the bags. The negro, moreover, declared his conviction that there was a subterraneous spring near the spot where the treasure was deposited. The searches hitherto made have been very superficial, and it seems not impossible that, by dint of more active exertions, this concealed wealth may yet be brought to light."—*Tschudi, Travels in Peru*, p. 67. But there can be no doubt that the Jesuits have long since managed to abstract their concealed treasure. This fact of the preparation, like many others, shows why no money of any amount worth naming, and no damaging documents were even found in the suppressed houses. All had been carefully put out of harm's way by the wily fathers. In the *Reflections of a Portuguese*, the English reader will find an ample account of the causes which directly conspired to the destruction of the Company—in truth the cup was full—and the *world's vengeance* came as a whirlwind demanding satisfaction. See also Robertson, *Letters on Paraguay*, ii. pp. 80, *et seq.* ; Smith's *Mem. of Pombal*, i. 168, *et seq.*, and George Moore, *Lives of Alberoni, Ripperda, and Pombal*, pp. 295, *et seq.*

The election of Clement XIV., which followed in due time, was effected by these princes. This is not denied by any party. The princes of the earth placed in the papal chair a man who was to fulfil a written promise to suppress the Jesuits. So the vicegerent of the Redeemer—the exponent of councils over which the Holy Ghost presides—sold himself to a party, and the price was the honour of the pontificate !

Ricci was the last general of the Jesuits before the suppression. If the accounts respecting the doings at Rome, during the period in question, be correct, that man was bitterly humbled by his former friends ; still he exerted himself to his utmost in endeavouring to avert the ruin of his Order ; but failed. Ganganelli assumed the tiara ; and after the most disgraceful tergiversations, displaying a degree of weakness that would cover the pettiest prince of Europe with scorn—the *Pope* of Rome condemned the Jesuits—the *Pope* did this—compelled by the kings of the earth, whom his predecessors had trampled to the dust ! Here was a retribution indeed ! The Breve of Suppression was ready on the 21st of July, 1773, and began with the words,—“Our Lord and Redeemer !”

Dread must have been the anxiety of the Jesuits whilst that conclave was preparing their destruction ! If the authorities of Count Alexis de Saint Priest be true—(he seems to be an impartial historian), the last struggles of the Jesuits were truly *systematic*, that is, in accordance with the theory by these pages unfolded.

Father Delci started for Leghorn, with the treasures of the Order, intending to transport them to England ; but Ricci stopped the pusillanimous flight.

The fortune of Cromwell was decided, the star of Napoleon was made a sun, by that supernatural bold-

ness inspired by the emergency of life or death ! Ricci put forth his character, or rather, he rose with the occasion. Anxious, disturbed, he was seen hurrying from place to place ;—"one while mingling in the numerous bodies of the Guarda Nobile, the pompous escort of the dinners of the cardinals, which are carried through the city in rich litters ; at another time, mixing in the groups of the grave Trasteverini, or the motley crowds of cattle-drivers and peasants assembled from the Sabine territory, Tivoli, Albano, and every part of the Pontine marshes, to witness the grand ceremony. At daybreak Ricci was on foot, traversing every quarter of the city, from Ponte-Mola to the Basilica of the Lateran. The Jesuits *de consideration* (so styled in a cotemporary document), imitating the example of their chief, were continually engaged in paying visits to the confessors and friends of the cardinals ; whilst, loaded with presents, they humbled themselves at the feet of the Roman princes and ladies of rank. Nor was all this attention superfluous : the current of public favour had already been diverted from the Jesuits ; and, amongst other fatal prognostics, the Prince de Piombino, a partisan of Spain, had withdrawn from the use of the general the carriage which his family had for more than a century placed at his disposal." The last general of this redoubtable Society threw himself at the feet of the cardinals ; and in tears, "commended to their protection that Society which had been approved by so many pontiffs, and sanctioned by a general council—the Council of Trent : he reminded the cardinals of his services, and claimed the merit of them, without casting blame upon any court or cabinet. Then, in an under tone, and in the freedom of secret conference, he represented to the princes of the church the indignity of the yoke


which these courts were attempting to impose upon them.”¹ But the honour of the popedom was sold and bought ; *Judas, the Iscariot*, with the price of blood in his hands, not *Peter* in repentance, was now to be the papal model !

Joseph II. of Austria would be present at Rome on that pregnant occasion. On this straw of royalty the Jesuits fondly relied : he stooped to *insult* the men who could not resent the injury ! He paid a visit to the *Gran Gesù*, a “house” of the Order, and a perfect marvel of magnificence and bad taste. The general approached the emperor, prostrating himself before him with profound humility. Joseph, without giving him time to speak, asked him coldly when he was going to relinquish his habit ? Ricci turned pale, and muttered a few inarticulate words : he confessed that the times were very hard for his brethren, but added that they placed their trust in God and in the holy father, whose infallibility would be for ever compromised if he destroyed an Order which had received the sanction and approval of his predecessors. The emperor smiled, and, almost at the same moment, fixing his eye upon the tabernacle, he stopped before the statue of St. Ignatius, of massive silver and glittering with precious stones, and exclaimed against the prodigious sum which it must have cost. “Sire,” stammered the father-general, “this statue has been erected with the money of the friends of the Society.” “Say, rather,” replies Joseph, “with the profits of the Indies !”²

Clement XIV. died. Very suspicious symptoms attended his death ; he was probably poisoned : but I can find no proof that the Jesuits promoted the crime,

¹ Saint Priest.

² Saint Priest, *Fall of the Jesuits*.




though such is the implied accusation. Nay, Ricci, the general, is said to have visited the “prophetess” who *foretold* the pope’s death!¹

What motive could the Jesuits have for desiring the pope’s death? I discard the idea of mere *revenge*,—but was there hope in the probable successor? This is the most dismal page of their history; if guilty of all the alleged crimes and misdemeanours, they became doubly so by their humiliations—such is the world’s judgment.

The successor of Clement XIV. connived at the disobedience of the Jesuits in not being abolished. Frederick, the King of Prussia, gave them an asylum, and they were permitted to open a Novitiate in Russia by the Empress Catharine, and by the ambiguous will of the pope who, like his predecessor, feared to offend the crowned heads, the foes of the Jesuits, who had caused their suppression.

¹ Saint Priest. In the *Documents concernans la Compagnie de Jésus*, there is a frightful account of the pope’s horrible disease. The object of the Jesuit-writer is to impress the idea of a Divine judgment, but on reading it, I felt convinced more than ever that Clement XIV. was poisoned. See *Documents*, t. iii. *Extinction de la Comp.* Cretineau published last year an account of the suppression, entitled *Clement XIV. et les Jésuites*. He brings forth nothing more of importance on the subject—except additional proofs of the baseness of the Roman Court—thus disgracing his Church to shield the Jesuits—the usual process when no other offers itself. Ricci, the bishop of Pistoie and Prato, states his belief that Clement XIV. was poisoned. This bishop was related to the general of the Jesuits, but by no means blind to the corruption of the Company. See his *Mémoires*, by De Potter, i. 23, and p. 151, for the account of the pope’s malady and death, sent by the Spanish minister to the Court of Madrid. See also pp. 193, *et seq.* for the examination of the ex-general. De Potter observes: “However guilty were both Ricci and his Company (a fact which we can no longer doubt), still, he had the right to be treated legally, without there being secret and inquisitorial interrogatories and extra-judicial measures of rigour to give all the appearance of a persecution to a procedure which had become indispensable to the safety and tranquillity of all Catholic governments.”—*Ubi suprâ*, p. 30. Saint Priest’s work, *Histoire de la Chute des Jésuites* is the best book on the suppression. There is an English translation which is very correct.



EPILOGUE OF THE REVIVAL.

WHAT a striking metamorphosis of that vigorous eagle which, two hundred and thirty years before, arose on ardent pinions from the centre of Catholicism, flapped her resounding wings over the universe, alighting where she listed ! What was the object of the Ignatian scheme ? To restore Catholicism—to win back all that the popedom had lost—to achieve a complete restoration of the ancient faith. We have witnessed the efforts of the Jesuits—we have seen their triumphs—and now, what is the fact—the mighty fact which stared them in the face ? Why, that their downfall was the most undeniable evidence that the popedom was sunk in hopeless degradation—the spirit of Catholicism scarcely anywhere unalloyed by doubt, or indifference—the Catholic kingdoms of Europe shorn of their greatness—whilst the *Protestant* dynasties (the object of Jesuit-machination from the beginning) soared triumphant in the

sphere of politics, deriving their power, wealth, and glory, from the expanding energies of Protestantism.

Their missionary schemes were totally ruined or completely unproductive of the results specified in the charter of their apostolate, as the one thing needful—all had vanished, though the Curious and Edifying Letters may continue to mystify a portion of mankind for ever.

Their educational-scheme, so universal, that it absorbed the children of all ranks, from the scions of royalty to the sons of the peasant, had only stimulated the spirit of transition by the nurture of intellect amid the formalities of fantastic devotion. In truth, the Jesuits boast of many a great name, whose bearer had conned his lessons on their benches. This could not be otherwise when they so effectually pushed themselves forward, that all rivals shrank before them and resigned the monopoly of education to the fashionable Jesuits. From their own Company went forth the writers who unsettled the minds of mankind,—from their benches emerged a boy, predicted by his Jesuit-master to become “the standard of Deism in France,”—François Marie Arouet, *aliàs* Voltaire. These were unfortunate coincidences—and there were many others; but they are facts for consideration nevertheless.¹ Whose names were more frequently repeated during that highly-intellectual and sensual age than those of the Jesuits *Hardouin* and *Berruyer*? Though Jesuits, that is, professionally orthodox, these writers seconded the growing scepticism of the age, and sanctioned its extravagance respectively. Hardouin put forth ridiculous doubts as to the authenticity of the ancient classics, excepting only Cicero, Pliny’s Natural History, portions of Horace and the Georgics of Virgil

¹ See Alison, Europe, I. p. 136, for an interesting account of Voltaire.

—extending his doubts publicly, even to the Councils of the Church. La Croze, a Protestant, alludes to these facts with alarm at the very time ; and there can be no doubt that the spirit of religious doubt was intimately connected with these intellectual vagaries of the Jesuits. Their Father Petavius, a learned theologian of the Company, maintained opinions which induced his readers to rank him among the Socinians, whilst the same Hardouin whom I have mentioned, maintained the most fantastical notions on the Trinity, in his Commentary on the New Testament.¹ To say that Hardouin was censured by the general, is quite beside the question—his opinions went forth—the world received them—and they were in exact accordance with the spirit of the age—in *France*, at least, where the mighty social volcano was about to explode. The Jesuit Berruyer published his *History of the People of God*, being the History of the Bible ; I have read his work with no edification whatever. His object is evidently to assimilate the sentiments and motives of the scriptural characters with the sentiments and motives of the age for which he wrote—substituting the concoctions of his extravagant imagination for the simplicity of the bible-narrative. His Jews are fantastic Frenchmen, and his angels are argumentative Jesuits. The book was laughed at, and condemned by the pope—but still the original effect was unimpaired. Voltaire called Berruyer a fool—and religion was associated with the Jesuit.²

¹ It was my intention to examine more comprehensively the works of this extravagant Jesuit ; but though the materials are before me, I am compelled, for want of space, to dismiss the genius without further discussion.

² Nor must we forget the awfully silly prodigies which the Jesuits had put forth, as performed by their saints. Think of their Life of the Jesuit Colnagus, who was stated to have made water hot with a sign of the cross—to have turned thistles into roses—and changed “a glass of generous wine” into vinegar—and all for the mere fun of the thing, or the whim of the moment—as is expressly

Now, in the midst of these results, the Jesuits, as a body, adhered unswervingly to the doctrines of ecclesiastical authority and subordination. Whatever was at variance with these, whether actual unbelief, Jansenist notions, or reforming tendencies, all alike met with their uncompromising condemnation. This was in accordance with professional instinct : it was an infatuation ; for their moral inculcations were, as we have seen, completely accommodated to the spirit of the age. Thus they contributed to the motive-power of society, and yet would clog and stop its wheels, now rushing to a consummation, which the two preceding centuries of “religious” strife, amidst profligacy and despotism, rendered one of the most natural results in the history of mankind. The Churchmen, ever buttressed with abuses, became more or less contemptible in the generation which followed Bossuet. They had “got rid” of the Huguenots ; “the Church” seemed triumphant—they enjoyed the mock-security. The “philosophers” sprang up : there was no talent in the Church to meet them with argument. In this deficiency, they nevertheless annoyed, insulted, exasperated the spirit of liberalism around them. The Jesuits especially drew upon themselves marked hatred and opprobrium. The battle deepened. The first attack made on them was in the domain of thought and literature. They opposed to the multitude and vigour of their assailants rather a stubborn tenacity to doctrines once adopted, than the genuine weapons of intellectual warfare. “It is incomprehensible,” observes Ranke, “that neither they themselves, nor any of their colleagues in the faith, produced

evident in the narrative ! See *De Vitâ et Virtutibus R. P. Bernardi Colnagi à Soc. Jesu.* à J. Paullino, “ejusdem Societatis conscript.” *Anno Virginici partûs*, MDCLXII., pp. 332, 333.

a single original and effective book in defence of their cause, whilst the works of their antagonists inundated the world, and fixed the character of public opinion."

Once defeated in the field of doctrine, of science, and of intellect, it was impossible for them long to maintain their hold of power—which was in opposition to the spirit of the age. The Jesuits and ecclesiastical domination were arrayed against liberalism and political ambition—*exactly the position of Europe when their Company was established*. This is a striking fact, and completely attests the failure of Loyola's scheme, in its leading motive.

Now, in the middle of the eighteenth century, during the struggle of these two tendencies, reforming ministers came to the helm in almost all the Catholic states of Europe:—in France, Choiseul,—in Spain, Wall and Squillace,—in Naples, Tanucci,—in Portugal, Pombal; all of them men who had made it the great aim of their lives to bring down the ascendancy of the Church and its principles. In these politicians the opposition to ecclesiastical domination obtained representatives: their personal position was founded on that opposition; open warfare was the more unavoidable, since the Jesuits obstructed them by personal counteraction, and by their influence in the highest circles.¹

Meanwhile the history of the Jesuits, through more than two centuries of endless interference, affliction to humanity, was before the world. The abuses of the Company were prominent: she would consent to no reformation: she refused to yield a hair's breadth, and doggedly rejected every compromise which bore the slightest appearance of reform, in her intolerable pride and self-sufficiency. Thus she pronounced her doom—

¹ Ranke, p. 324.

and Pope Clement XIV. expressed it as follows: "Inspired by the Divine Spirit, as we trust, urged by the duty of restoring concord to the Church, convinced that the Company of Jesus can no longer effect those purposes for which it was founded, and moved by other motives of prudence and wise government which we keep locked in our own breast, we abolish, and annul the Company of Jesus, its offices, houses, and institutions."¹ The Jesuits had been expelled from more than thirty places and countries during their career: the Company now possessed, all over the world, 39 Provinces, 24 Houses for the Professed, 669 Colleges, 61 Novitiates, 176 Seminaries, 335 Residences, 223 Missions, and 22,787 members. And in this condition the Pope of Rome abandoned the Company to the *Catholic* reaction against ecclesiastical domination.

Unquestionably, this triumph was a dreadful blow to Catholicism. Defection from the Church spread more and more—yea, even Austria, with its Joseph II., shook off many of the papal shackles; and even Naples obliterated the last traces of feudal connection with the see of Rome.

The Jesuits and their friends ascribe the French Revolution to their suppression. What ignorance of history is assumed in this assertion of pitiful conceit! A thousand volumes have detailed the numberless causes which produced that scourge of humanity:—diseases of royalty, diseases of the nobility, diseases of the Church, diseases in the public mind, aggravated by the most ruinous and disgusting abuses in government;—these were the causes of the French Revolution; and had the Jesuits existed as a Company during the sixteen years after the suppression, they would unquestionably have

¹ Ranke, p. 327. See the Breve, apud Saint Priest, p. 393.

deepened the frightful contest, and enhanced the horrors of that victory which they could never have prevented.¹

The ex-Jesuits were dispersed over the world as chaplains, teachers, professors, and authors, whilst the English members went on as usual. Indeed, it would appear from a letter of Pombal, that the English government secretly patronised the Jesuits, for political purposes. Saint Priest publishes the letter : if its statement be false, it still shows that Pombal feared “the immense power of the Jesuits.”² Of course, the Jesuits made no demonstration against the blow which struck them down :—it would have been utterly useless ;—nay, would have aggravated their calamity. One of them, in the foreign missions, dropped down dead on the spot when the suppression was announced to him.

Frederick, the Protestant king of Prussia, with whom the ex-general Ricci had corresponded, craving his protection, gave the Jesuits an asylum in Silesia. He had annexed that Catholic province to his dominions, and he thought the Jesuits would conciliate the minds of the people to subjection, since the Jesuits generally seconded the powers which befriended them : besides, the Jesuits were still influential in Poland, and Frederick thought he had better make friends of them, to suit his purposes.³

And Catherine II. of Russia received the Jesuits. She gave them an establishment in the Polish province of the empire. Her motive was political : the Jesuits gave her powerful support in her designs on Poland. In 1772, when the first division of Poland was made, the Jesuits had at Polotsk a magnificent college, surrounded with vast domains, and possessed, as serfs, 10,000 peasants, a part of whom were on the left bank,

¹ See Alison, Europe, I. c. ii. for ample details on the subject.

² “Chute des Jésuites,” Append. I.

³ Saint Priest, *ut anted*, p. 225.

and the rest on the right, of the Dwina. Over the whole country they had immense influence. When the pope suppressed the Company, they passed over from the left bank of the Dwina, which was Polish, to the right, which was already Russian,—and swore fidelity to Catherine. At their instigation the publication of the Breve of Suppression was prohibited in all the Russias ; and they maintained their position exactly as though the Company had not been abolished by the popedom. Strange, that the Jesuits themselves should give an example to the world of disobedience to that power which they were established to obey implicitly, and defend to the utmost of their power. Nay, they set up, or at all events supported, a Catholic primate or patriarch in Russia. The man had been a Calvinist, had married, and become a priest of doubtful Catholicity. Yet an ex-Jesuit became his coadjutor ; and, backed by Catherine, he went to Rome, and boldly and haughtily demanded the pallium for the “ Archbishop of Mohilow,” as the creature was titled. Pope Pius VI. demurred : the Jesuit, Benislowski by name, protested he would not leave the papal antechamber until his demand was granted. Pius VI. gave way : then a nuncio went to St. Petersburg ; and the pope secretly encouraged the Company in Russia, whilst he maintained its suppression. Strange situation for a religious Order—rebellious to the popedom—supported by all the powers separated from Rome, against all the powers connected with its religion,—and still more strange the fact, that the popedom was now at variance with itself,—condemning and yet encouraging the Company at the same time ! Enough, surely, in these facts for the meditation of Catholics !¹

¹ Saint Priest, *ut antea*, pp. 251, *et seq.*

The Jesuits elected one Grouber for their general, and everything went on as usual. The numerous literati of the ex-Company laboured with great industry ; and the most lasting works of the Jesuits were published during the period of the suppression. Boscovich, the celebrated mathematician, astronomer, and *poet*, flourished in those days. It is curious that the Royal Society of London recommended this Jesuit as a proper person to be appointed to observe the transit of Venus in California ; but the suppression prevented his acceptance of the appointment. The ex-Jesuit Andrès found an asylum at Mantua, under the roof of the Marquis Bianchi. He was the author of numerous works, among the rest a History of the Origin, Progress, and Actual State of Universal Literature, in seven volumes quarto. It is discursive and bottomless ; but still a valuable contribution to the literature of his Company.¹ The Jesuit Tiraboschi professed rhetoric with great distinction at Milan, and was subsequently knighted, and promoted to a place in his cabinet, by the Duke of Modena ; whilst the city inscribed his name in the list of its nobles. He was a voluminous writer, and his “History of Italian Literature, Ancient and Modern,” is a work of immense erudition, admirably written, and must ever maintain for its author a place amongst the most distinguished critics. It extends to thirteen volumes in quarto.²

Numerous other works were published by the ex-Jesuits, among the rest, an *Universal Biography*, by *De Feller*, which was a clever scheme of Jesuitism ; for it enabled them to do as they liked with the characters of history, in connection with that of their own Company.

¹ “Dell’ Origine, de’ Progressi, e Dello Stato Attuale d’Ogni Letteratura.”

² “Storia della Letteratura Italiana, del Cavaliere Abate Girolamo Tiraboschi.”

The groundwork of the publication was copied from a similar work by Chaudon ; but, for the reason above given, Feller's Dictionary is full of errors, and displays a revolting partiality. It is the standard biographical authority of the Catholics, and has gone through numerous editions, considerably enlarged by subsequent editors.

In 1814, Pope Pius VII. restored the Jesuits as an Order, revoking the breve of Clement XIV., for the pope whom Napoleon had humbled into strange steps for the Head of the Church to take, and had imprisoned, was led to believe that the public sanction of the Company, by a formal restoration, would give an impulse to the Catholic cause ; but considerable resistance was made to the restoration in Catholic kingdoms.¹

Two years after, in 1816, the Emperor Alexander expelled the Jesuits from Russia for "sowing discord" and making "conversions,"—which, I suppose, were scrupulously refrained from by the primitive refugees of Jesuitism.

In 1824 the Jesuits met with a formidable opponent in the Count de Montlosier, who vigorously denounced the Company as "a system religious and political, tending to overturn religion, society, and the throne." It was a stand against *Ultramontanism* or the views of the papal court—to uphold which in France was the leading motive of Pius VII. in restoring the Jesuits. Montlosier's work is well-written, forceful, and highly deserving of attentive perusal.²

Soon after, the Abbé De la Roche-Arnaud published his "Jesuites Modernes," in which he drew a frightful

¹ See Hist. des Jesuites, ii. c. xi. for a striking summary of Pius VII.'s pontificate. This work was written by M. G. de la Billenerie.

² "Mémoire à consulter sur un Système religieux et politique tendant à renverser la Religion, la Société, et le Trône, par M. le Comte de Montlosier."

picture of reviving Jesuitism in France ; and then he wrote his "Memoirs of a Young Jesuit," detailing his own experience among the fathers, for he had been a novice at Mont-Rouge. Nothing can exceed the disgusting things he relates of the Jesuits in their private conduct ; and he traces the history of the Jesuits in France throughout the Revolution and the subsequent reigns, with damaging details, if true :—but Cretineau says that the author repented, and retracted all he had written ; a fact which needs better confirmation than Jesuit authority.¹

Michelet and Quinet, with Eugene Sue, in 1845, took the Jesuits in hand, with great effect—and the Company was expelled from France, by way of a "retirement," commanded by the General Roothan. Just before, the Jesuits had been robbed of 10,000*l.* by their procurator, one Affnaer, a consummate rogue, who falsified their accounts, and spent the Jesuit-money on his horses, mistresses, and boon companions.² This large loss did not ruin them, and the fact is important. All their property had been confiscated, and yet, after the suppression, we find them flourishing in abundance. In Ireland they bought a mansion for 16,000*l.*³ It is difficult to account for these large means, without taking it for granted, that the Jesuits were wise enough in their generation to help themselves, before they permitted their needy foes to clutch their earnings.

The late expulsion of the Jesuits from Switzerland has been followed by their banishment from Bavaria, Austria, Naples, and from *Rome itself*, by Pope Pius IX.,—an event which in former times would have been an epoch in the world's history : but Pope Pius IX.

¹ "Mémoires d'un Jeune Jésuite," &c. ; it was translated into several languages.

² Cretineau, vi. 498.

³ Dr. Doyle, Evidence to the Parliament, March, 1825.

expelled the Jesuits without the slightest difficulty ; and they have taken refuge in England, where, with their General, Roothan, they now enjoy the hospitality of a Catholic nobleman in one of his mansions. Their pupils maltreated them when they left the Roman College—an event disgraceful to the pupils, but still significant. When they lost the respect of their pupils in former times, they were advancing to their downfall.

The rich province of England is likely to be the general refuge of the whole Company in Europe. The origin of the Jesuit-wealth in England is interesting. When their colleges at St. Omer, Bruges, and Ghent crumbled under the horns of the Papal bull, the establishment at Liege was somehow spared. The French Revolution supervened : that avenger included the Jesuits in its fearful retribution ; the college at Liege was destroyed ; the Jesuits and their pupils were expelled. This misfortune was the harbinger of prosperity to the Belgian Jesuits. They took refuge in England ; and the generous Thomas Weld, of Lulworth Castle, a Catholic gentleman, presented the exiles with the domain of Stonyhurst.¹

It is impossible to state precisely the number of the modern Jesuits ; certainly it is not less than 7,000 of all ranks in the Company, scattered and lurking over France, Italy, Germany ; settled in various “ Missions ” in the East and the West, whence they contribute “ edifying letters ” for the “ Annals of the Propagation ; ” but these letters are very far from being as “ curious ” as those of old : the energy, the talent of the Company passed away with the last failures of the original Company. The modern Jesuits may have,

¹ For details on Stonyhurst, see “ The Novitiate,” pp. 36, *et seq.*, 2nd edit.

according to Gioberti, all the craft and cunning of their forefathers, but neither as apostles, nor as men of science, nor as authors, nor as teachers, can they claim the slightest right to be named with the Jesuits of old.¹ It was to me a most remarkable fact, that whilst at St. Cuthbert's College the educational system of the Jesuits was carried out to the utmost extent (as I can attest from the experience of six years nearly), I found little or nothing of the sort at Stonyhurst ; and the pupils

¹ The following summary gives the numerical force of the Jesuits in 1845.—

In the province of Turin the number of the Jesuits increased between the 1st of January, 1841, and the 1st of January, 1845, from 379 to 428. They have in Turin a “noble” college, another college and a *pensionnat*, including 81 Jesuits ; a professed house at Genoa ; novitiates at Chiari and at Cagliari ; colleges and *pensionnats* at Aosta, Chambery, Genoa, Nice, Novara, Cagliari, San Remo and Voghera. Since the commencement of the year 1845, a new college has been opened at Massa.

The establishments of the province of Spain have been disorganised by the political events which have convulsed that country. In 1845, there were 113 Jesuits disseminated in Spain, particularly in the dioceses of Toledo, Seville, Pampeluna, and Valencia. This province has a “residence” at Nivelles in Belgium, and another at Aire, in France ; it has also residences in South America, namely, in Paraguay, Uruguay, La Plata, Brazil, New Grenada and Chili. Another list gives 536 Jesuits in Spain. (Frankfort Postamts Zeitung.)

At the commencement of 1845, the province of Paris, which includes the northern part of France, numbered 420 Jesuits, thus giving an increase of 129 from the year 1841.

The province of Lyons includes the southern part of France ; in 1841 it contained 290 Jesuits, in 1845, 446,—scattered over the country,—at Lyons, Bordeaux, Dole, Grenoble, Marseilles, Toulouse, and Avignon, as priests, novices, and brothers. The Society in France numbered 372 Jesuits.

As the colleges are not open to them in France, they have founded one in the frontiers of the kingdom, at Bruges, in Belgium. The French province has still nineteen Jesuits, employed on the mission in Grenada, and eight in China : it also possesses, in North America, two flourishing establishments, containing nineteen priests, thirty-five novices, and eleven brothers. These are the novitiate of St. Mary, and the college of Louisville, in the state of Kentucky.

The French province had also thirty-nine Jesuits in Africa, namely, at Algiers, Oran, and Constantine ; also twenty-two missionaries in the East Indies—at Trichinopoly, in the presidency of Madras, and in the island of *Madura* ; ten in Syria, and six in Madagascar.

The province of Belgium is one of the most flourishing at the present time. In 1841, there were 319 Jesuits in that province ; there are now 472. The novitiate of Tronchiennes contains 129. They have colleges at Alost, Antwerp,

who had passed through their "Humanity studies" had evidently not attained the acquirements prescribed by the *Ratio Studiorum*. The English fathers cannot do better than strictly adhere to the letter of the educational law, as laid down with the sanction of the glorious Aquaviva.

Nevertheless, the establishment "pays:" for the "gratis-instruction" was not renovated at the restoration of the Company. The College of Stonyhurst must receive, on an average, at least 6,000*l.* per annum from pupils:—the number being about 120, at 40 guineas per annum, for boys under twelve years of age; for those above that age, 50 guineas; and for students in philosophy, 100 guineas. Besides this, the college possesses and farms some thousand acres of good land, over which one of the fathers presides as procurator. The Jesuits are highly esteemed in the neighbourhood: their handsome church is thronged on Sundays and festivals; and on stated occasions, they distribute portions of meat to the poor, besides supporting a small school for their children. Hence they have influence in those parts, as any Member of Parliament will find to his cost, should he not make friends with the Jesuits.

Brussels, Ghent, Louvain, Namur, Liege, &c.: residences at Bruges, Courtray, and Mons: missions at Amsterdam, the Hague, Nimeguen, Dusseldorf, and in Guatemala, in America.

The province of Germany includes Switzerland, which contained 245 Jesuits in 1841, and 273 in 1844.

There are eighty-eight "houses" in Germany, containing 1000 Jesuits, of whom 400 are priests.

In Columbia, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania, the Jesuits have found a footing,—and "go ahead" in "the land of the Free and the Brave," as gaily as all other speculators—staunch republicans. In my fifteenth year, I met one of their priests at Baltimore, in Maryland, whilst on my way to England from the West Indies. He wished me to stay and enter at their college—but, in spite of his great kindness, I preferred my original destination, and went to St. Cuthbert's, in the county of Durham, in England.

The English fathers have no less than thirty-three establishments, or colleges, residences, and missions in England. Of course Stonyhurst is the principal establishment, where the Provincial of England resides. The college in 1845 contained twenty priests, twenty-six novices and scholastics, and fourteen lay-brothers.¹

Of the 806 missionary priests in Great Britain, including bishops, the Jesuits alone can say how many are enlisted under the banner of Ignatius, though, doubtless, this knowledge is shared by the "Vicars-Apostolic" of the various districts in which they are privileged to move unmolested. The Jesuits are muffled in England; it is difficult to distinguish them in the names of the Catholic lists annually published. They have established a classical and commercial academy at Mount St. Mary's, near Chesterfield; and the prospectus of the establishment, after describing the suit of clothes that the pupils are to bring, not forgetting the ominous "Oxford mixture"²—simply informs the world that "the college is conducted by *gentlemen connected with the college of Stonyhurst.*" These "gentlemen" are generally

¹ A letter has been placed in my hands, of whose authenticity I have no doubt whatever, the post mark with the cost of postage being duly marked on the face of it, and the whole statement presenting not a single feature of forgery. It is addressed to a Count de ———, who, during the French Revolution, was in a merchant's counting-house in England. I mention this circumstance to account for the fact that the letter is written in English. It is dated April 26th, 1823, English College, Rome. The party who writes the letter bears the name of one of the Catholic priests now in England. The contents are very curious. It is an account of the writer's application for admission into the English Company, and the bargain proposed to his father, by the Jesuit-agent (whose name is mentioned in the letter) in a consultation after the application for admission. His father was induced "to give almost half his property in ready money" as the terms of admission. The youth, as he states, demurred at this, considering the condition of his family. The agent said he would "write for further instructions." "It was not long before I did receive a very short letter from him—but judge of my disappointment to find by it, that all further negotiation was to be broken off, without any cause being assigned."

² Cath. Direct. p. 126—"trousers of Oxford mixture."

sent out in *pairs*, by the provincial, according to the Constitutions, and thus they may charm by variety ; for the quantity of work on hand in the various Jesuit missions in England is by no means so evident as the speculation for *more*, by this constitutional provision. The *secular* priests are doubled and tripled by the *necessities* of the mission ; the Jesuits are doubled, tripled, and quadrupled, by the requirement of the Constitutions, *and* the *prospects* before them.

The Jesuits in England dress as any clergyman, or any gentleman : by their outward man you cannot tell them. Strange notions are afloat respecting these men. I have been asked if I do not think that there are Jesuits *incognito* in the University of Oxford. This question I cannot undertake to answer. Such a speculation would indeed be a bold one, even in the Jesuits : but then, consider *De' Nobili, Beschi, &c.* ; surely, if a Jesuit may assume the *Brahmin* and *Pariah*, in order to “ingraft Christianity on Paganism,” he may assume the *Protestant*, in order to ingraft Romanism on Protestantism, firmly convinced of Lucian’s axiom, namely, that “a beginning is the half of everything.”¹ This is arguing from the past to the present—nothing more.²

Again have I been asked, by what sign can one

¹ Ἀρχὴ ἡμῶν παντός.

² “The following narrative is a true copy taken from the registry of the episcopal See of Rochester, in that book which begins Ann. 2 & 3, Phil. et Mar., and is continued to 15 Eliz. : ‘In the year 1568, being the eleventh of Queen Elizabeth, one Thomas Heth, brother of Nicholas Heth, Bishop of Rochester, in the time of Henry VIII., came to the Dean of Rochester, made application to him to present him to the bishop, in order to some preferment. The dean thought it fit to hear the said Thomas Heth preach in the cathedral church, before he would interest himself in his behalf to the bishop. Accordingly, he appointed him to preach upon the 21st of November, when he took his text out of Acts xii. 8: “Peter therefore was kept in prison, but prayers were made without ceasing of the Church to God for him.” But so it happened, that while he was preaching, casually pulling out his handkerchief, a letter dropt into the bottom

distinguish a Jesuit? Perhaps the sign whereby you may know the Jesuits, is their being better housed, better clothed, and better fed than most other Roman Catholic priests. This sign is, of course, equivocal: but the *fact* is undeniable: the “missionary funds” of the Jesuits are liberally applied—to their members; to these “they give freely what they have freely received.” In other respects the Jesuits show themselves by “results.” They dare not interfere openly in missions pre-occupied by the secular clergy: but they are independent of the Roman Catholic bishops, except for ordination, which is a matter of course. Still, perhaps I am justified in believing that their movements in London are considered by many of the orthodox as somewhat encroaching.

If these “doings” in London are “for a sign” as to their other localities, they are not idle. Nine years ago, there were only two Jesuits in London; there are now at least *four* in one “residence;” and if their great church in Berkeley-square be now finished, there must be

of the pulpit, directed to him, by the name of Thomas Finne, from one Samuel Malt, a notorious English Jesuit, then at Madrid, in Spain. The letter being found in the pulpit, by Richard Fisher, sexton of the cathedral, he carried it immediately to the dean, who, upon perusal, went presently to the Rev. Edmond Gest, then the bishop of that see, who, upon reading it, instantly caused the said Heth to be apprehended, and the next day brought him to examination. The letter was as follows: “Brother,—The council of our fraternity have thought fit to send you, David George, Theodorus Sartor, and John Huts, their collections, which you may distribute wherever you may see it may be for your purpose, according to the people’s inclination”—and thus concludes: “This we have certified to the council and cardinals, that there is no other way to prevent people from turning heretics, and for recalling of others back again to the mother Church, than by the diversities of doctrines. We all wish you to prosper.—Madrid, Oct. 28, 1563. SAM. MALT.” “Dr. Nalson, in his marginal notes, desires the reader seriously to observe, that the Jesuits, pope, and cardinals, have laid down this maxim, that divisions and separations are the most effectual way to introduce popery, and ruin the Protestant religion.”—*London Magazine*, April, 1761, p. 192.

twelve Jesuits in London, to “serve” their metropolitan speculation, as was intended.¹

Every year a bill is proposed to Parliament for the removal of Catholic disabilities, including a clause in favour of the Jesuits. A cunning minister would certainly shake hands with the Jesuits, because such a man is apt to overreach himself; an honest, prudent minister would, in the present state of all parties, take time and consider the matter and the men, and would perhaps die undecided what to do—so hard is all Jesuit matter to understand in all its bearings;—but your slashing, keep-pace-with-the-times minister would use Jesuits to serve his purposes, and then sacrifice them, as every other friend or foe, to expediency—if the Jesuits would be simple enough to be caught a second time—*which is quite possible*;—for it is astonishing how a little sunshine, after dull weather, deceives the ants, bees, ground-worms, all the natural barometers of earth!

On the other hand, would not a general toleration be much more honest and honourable than the present connivance at an open infringement of the law of the land? By this law, the Jesuits who come into England are liable to transportation, and those who are in the country are bound by certain penalties. It is a disgrace to the nation to prosecute a smuggler, and spare a Jesuit. The law should certainly be repealed, and *perfect toleration* granted, as the most effectual means of undermining the influence of the Romish Church in England.

In general, the Romish clergy are very worthy and

¹ There are two Jesuits at Norwich, with a very fine chapel, and exceedingly comfortable “residence.” Last year they beautified their chapel, and gave a grand opening to the completion. The picture which before hung behind the altar, was taken down to make room for another. Strange, but true,—the Jesuits had the old one *raffled for* at half-a-crown the chance! It was “Descent from the Cross.”

respectable men ; men of pleasing manners, placid, mild, charitable, and exceedingly well informed—much more so than the Jesuits, whose system of education is by no means as good as that pursued by the other Catholic collegiate bodies in England. According to Gioberti, they are under the same disadvantage in Italy. Among the members of the Catholic clergy in England, whose conduct is reprehensible, are the “*converts*”—the Protestants who have turned priests. These men are the very plagues of society. Woe to the poor Protestant wife of a Catholic with whom these zealous individuals may be acquainted ! she will be pursued, without respite, until she surrenders to “the faith.” It is said, that the propagandism of one’s belief is a sign of its sincerity ; but, unfortunately, the process so often leads to affliction that we may be permitted to believe it one of the most dangerous practices of our *modern* Christianity.

Still, let there be universal toleration. Let there be no difference whatever between Protestant and Catholic, except what each shall achieve by his manual or intellectual industry. It is a disgrace to Protestants to fear the Church of Rome. Look to facts. In the time of Elizabeth, there were in England, as we have seen, more than 400 priests. Since then the population has been quadrupled, and yet in all Great Britain there are only 806 Catholic priests—a great many of whom are engaged in the education of youth or doing nothing in the colleges. Now we have, I believe, 12,000 clergymen of the Established Church, and a countless multitude of dissenting ministers to meet this array of Romanism, in a fair intellectual and moral battle. Surely, the whole moral of these pages must declare that neither money, power, craft, nor persecution, can uphold a set of opinions—and that, by letting all have their own way,

those who are the greatest rogues will soonest bring about their own destruction.

In addition to this argument, it should be remembered that the Catholic nobility and gentry of England constitute a very respectable multitude; that many are connected by marriage with Protestant families; and not a few in Parliament.¹ Unquestionably the time is come when governments and "parties" must see that the human mind is but very little influenced by the mere *interests* of their religious teachers. Perfect toleration will make those fall who are upheld only by *privilege* and *position*.

The English province has twenty missionaries at Calcutta, and a "house," or residence, in Jamaica. It was asserted, in 1845, that the English government was even assisting the Jesuits, at that time, to found a new college, especially destined for China. Assuredly England is making ample amends for her ancient persecutions of the Catholics and Jesuits. But as Divine Providence weighs *motives*, not actions, time only will unravel the mystery. The Jesuits will serve their patrons, and they will serve themselves, and the history to come, like all history, will have many points of resemblance to that of the past.

The vice-province of Ireland numbered sixty-three Jesuits in 1841, and seventy-three in 1844. They possess, in Ireland, the colleges of Conglowes, Tollabey, and Dublin. They have recently established a second "house" in the last-mentioned city.

But the day of the Jesuits is passed for ever. Awhile they may yet interfere in the concerns of the world :

¹ See "Blackwood's Magazine," Oct. 1838 : "The Progress of Popery in the British Dominions and Elsewhere." It is reprinted by Nisbet, Berners-street.

but never more will they either rule or “convert” kingdoms. Men’s eyes are opened. A simple faith alone will be admitted between man’s conscience and his God. Soon shall we have reason to forget that Rome ever existed, as a popedom ; or, if we cannot forget the awful fact in Christendom, the remembrance will be supportable when ecclesiastical domination of every possible kind shall cease, and the sacred name of religion be no longer obnoxious to the obloquy of men.

Beautiful image, entrancing reality of the Redeemer’s religion ! When shall it bless mankind with all its heavenly gifts ! Its never-ceasing faith, hope, and charity—love that strives to find and succeeds in finding motives to love on, in all that is man, in all that is created—and rises, from every contemplation, with renewed benevolence that prompts the heart to attest its faith, hope, and charity by *deeds*, such as a God vouchsafed to model for the imitation of his creature. How simple, and yet how sublime ! The parching blast of exclusive opinions dries up the heart ; but the gentle glow of charity makes it the centre whence a thousand rays shall diverge, and move on for ever—refracted or reflected—but still indestructible, and never ceasing to fulfil their destiny—good to all whom the God of all wills us to cherish as friends, as brothers.

THE END.



[illegible]

UNIVERSITY PRODUCTS, INC. #859-5503



3 9031 01701894 6

